

MAY 19 1909

THE MONTHLY

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 539 (NEW SERIES 149) MAY, 1909

CONTENTS

BLESSED JOAN OF ARC IN ENGLISH OPINION.	
	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i> 449
THE SALFORD DIOCESAN CATHOLIC FEDERATION.	
	<i>By the Rev. T. Sharrock and T. F. Burns</i> 465
SOME OF NATURE'S WHIMS.....	<i>By the Editor</i> 477
THE CATHOLIC WOMEN'S LEAGUE	<i>By P.</i> 484
ST. ANSELM OF CANTERBURY.....	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i> 494
INTOLERANCE, PERSECUTION, AND PROSELYTISM.	
	<i>By the Rev. Joseph Keating</i> 512
ON A WESTERN ISLAND	<i>By Alice Dease</i> 523
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....	530
The Jesuit Bogey in <i>ex cathedra</i> .	
Nonconformist Unity.	
St. Anselm's Doctrine.	
REVIEWS	536
SHORT NOTICES	552
BOOKS RECEIVED	558
SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS	560

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(SEVENTEENTH TO NINETEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Seventh to Ninth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.

d

,
st.

H
y-

or
on.

nd

n.
nd.
d).

a.

*Blessed Joan of Arc in English Opinion.*¹

We'll set thy statue in some holy place
And have thee revered like a blessed saint.
Employ thee, then, sweet virgin, for our good.
(*I, Henry VI., Act iii., Sc. 3.*)

ALTHOUGH the first appearance of Joan la Pucelle in English literature is connected in the minds of most readers with the Shakespearean play of *I, King Henry VI.*, it was undoubtedly through the chroniclers of an earlier period that the English opinion of the Maid first took consistent shape. Almost all critics are now agreed that Shakespeare himself had little to do with the writing of *I, King Henry VI.*, but whoever the real author was, he was not creating a type, but only embodying a detestable presentment of the Maid which had already established itself firmly in English tradition. The conception does not seem to have been invented entirely by her contemporaries.² Strange to say we find that in the first half of the fifteenth century the chroniclers are extraordinarily silent on the subject of the Maid. William of Worcester, who actually took part in the campaign, confines himself to the barest mention of the maiden warrior who was called the Pucelle de Dieu, and who, after certain successes in the field, was finally put to death as a witch. The chronicles of that age, although they do not rival the splendour and fulness of detail of the thirteenth century, are not inconsiderable in number. The nature of their references to the Pucelle seems to show that whatever impression Jeanne's wonderful personality and career may have produced upon those who were fighting against her upon the spot, her renown had hardly

¹ This article is in part identical with one contributed by the writer to the special Jeanne d'Arc number of the *Études* (April 20, 1909), and which has been published in connection with the recent Beatification.

² The letters written in the name of Henry VI. to justify the execution of the Maid, as also the letter of Bedford to the King in 1433, describe Joan as a sorceress, heretic and idolatress, but they do not venture to make any imputation against the purity of her life.

spread to England. Many of these histories make no mention of her at all. In others there is but the briefest allusion to her successes, and though she is characterized as a witch, no hint is conveyed of the terror she inspired among her adversaries. One brief entry in a Latin chronicle of that age may suffice as a specimen :

At which time the enemies of the King of England set up a Maid, whom they affirmed to have been sent to them by the special favour of Heaven to give them the victory over the English, and they called her the Pucelle de Dieu, *i.e.*, one sent by God to their assistance. But they were disappointed, because shortly afterwards she was taken prisoner and executed as a witch.¹

Caxton, both in his *Histories*, and in his edition of Higden's *Polychronicon*, has added a continuation bringing the story down to his own time. In these two works there is a short and identical notice of the Maid which also deserves to be quoted in part on account of its relation to the play of *I King Henry VI*. After a brief statement repeating the substance of the notices just referred to, Caxton continues :

The sayd Pucelle was taken in the felde armyd like a man and many other capitayns with her. And all [were] brought to Roan and there she was put in Pryson and there she was juged by the lawe to be brente.

And thenne she sayde that she was with chylde whereby she was respyted a whyle. But in conclusyon it was founde that she was not with chylde. And thenne she was brente in Roan.²

Whence this vile calumny about Joan having pleaded pregnancy arose is not clear. But the tale is repeated by Polydore Vergil, by Fabyan, and by Holinshed ; while the others who, like Hall and Grafton, do not mention this incident, denounce the Maid none the less as a sorceress and an impudent impostor. There is only one English chronicle during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which says nothing to her discredit. All honour be to John Rastell, the brother-in-law of Blessed Thomas More, and himself a confessor of the Faith,³

¹ *Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon Anglie*, Giles, 1848, p. 7. From MS. Royal 13 C. In the *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles*, edited by Dr. Gairdner, no mention at all is made of the Pucelle.

² Caxton, *Polychronicon*, Bk. VIII. fol. 335, fifth year of Henry VI. Identical with Caxton's *Chronicles*, Cap. 247. There were two or three editions, possibly more, of both these histories.

³ Rastell, who published his *Chronicle* in 1529, wrote in defence of the doctrine of Purgatory, and died in prison in 1536 or 1537.

who in his brief notice of the events of 1429—30, speaks of the great success achieved by the Pucelle, but refrains from all opprobrious epithets. The passage, though its sympathy is only negative, deserves to be quoted as the first sign of a wish on the part of Englishmen to do justice to their great adversary.

About this tyme [writes Rastell], a mayden called Jane, a poore manne's daughter in France, came to Charles the dolphyn of Fraunce, whome the Frenchmen call Kynge Charles VII., and said she was sent to hym by God to helpe to relieve the misery of Fraunce. Whereupon they gatte her armour and accompanied her with knyghts and souldyars, which went forth and gave many great conflycts to the Englishemen and won from them many great townes and holdes; and, as some wryters say, she, by her provydence, caused the sayd Charles to be crowned Kynge of Fraunce at Reynolds; but other wryters say he was never crowned tyll after the deth of the Duke of Bedforde. This sayde mayde, called by the Frenchmen "La Pucelle de Dieu," or the Mayd of God, put the Englishmen oft tymes to the wors; but yet at the last she with her companye at a place called Champange [*sic*] came to remove a siege laid therunto by the Duke of Burgon, and the Englishmen, and gave them battele. In whiche fight the Frenchmen were discomfyt, and there the sayd mayde was taken by a Burgonyon knyght, and after brought to Roan, where she was by the Englyshemen judged to dethe and brent.¹

When this represented the most favourable testimony in Joan's favour, it would have been a very wonderful thing if a playwright in the days of Elizabeth, setting aside the unanimous verdict of all the English chroniclers, had struck out for himself a novel and anti-nationalist interpretation of the career of the Maid.² The author of the play, whether it be Greene, or Marlowe, or Shakespeare, or some other, has not ventured to run counter to the legend current in his time, a legend which the Protestant prejudice of Hall and Holinshed, provoked by

¹ Rastell, *Chronicle*, edit. Dibdin (1811), p. 259. Polydore Vergil, who was not an Englishman, though he composed his History while resident in England, published his Chronicle in Latin, in 1534, a few years after Rastell. Vergil also shows some sympathy for Jeanne, though he repeats the story of her pretended pregnancy. For example, he says, "This saide sentence (of death at the stake) thus pronounced was thought the hardest that ever had benee remembered, which could neyther be mollified nor mittigated by lapse of time. Surely, it was of some thought that this woman, thus excited to martiall prowesse for defence of her country, was worthy favour, especially seeing there were many examples of mercie showed in such case." Eng. Trans. (Camden Soc.) 1844, p. 38.

² The eulogistic accounts of such Scottish chroniclers as the continuator of Fordun and the Monk of Pluscardine are no doubt much influenced by the fact that the Scots fought on the side of the Maid. Scottish opinion has always been in her favour.

the veneration shown to Jeanne by the majority of her countrymen, has rendered as extravagant and repulsive as possible. Holinshed spoke of the Maid as a "damnable sorceress suborned by Satan," and he descants with gusto upon her "execrable abominations." Hall overflows with taunts of the French nation that requires a girl, "a chambermaid in an inn, a beggar's brat," to show them the way to victory, urging that such could only be "an enchantress, an orgayne of the devil, sent from Sathan to blind the people and bring them in unbelife." The one abominable feature in the play which seems to owe its existence to the invention of the dramatist, is Joan's repudiation of her father in Act v. scene 4. The Duke of York's words which are pronounced at her final disappearance from the scene, are a mere echo of the language of the chroniclers :

Break thou in pieces and consume to ashes
Thou foul accursed minister of hell.

Of the gradual improvement in English feeling towards the Maid during the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries I do not propose to speak at any great length. The subject has been admirably treated by M. James Darmesteter and, following in his footsteps, but with an inferior knowledge of English literature in its various bearings, by MM. Rabbe, Servin, Haudecœur, and others. There can be no doubt that M. Darmesteter has correctly described the stages of the process as those of witch, heroine, and saint; but I should myself be inclined to attach rather more importance than he seems to do to the influence of certain translations from French originals, notably to de Serres' *History of France*, translated by Ed. Grimstone in 1607, and to the *History of England* of M. Rapin de Thoyras, which was several times reprinted after the year 1730.

How great was the influence of de Serres' work may be seen from the fact that John Speed, in his most important *History of Great Britaine*, written only four years later, in 1611, speaks of the Maid as follows :

Charles of France understanding the miserable straites of his deare City (Orelans) and ignorant how to remedy so neere a mischiefe, there presented herselfe unto him at Chinon a yong maid about eightene yeeres old called Joan of Loraine, daughter to James of Arck, dwelling in Domremy near Vaucateurs (*sic*), a Shepheardesse under her father, whose flockes she tended. She bids him not faint and constantly affirmes that God had sent her to deliver the realme of France from the

English yoake and restore him to the fulnesse of his fortunes. She was not forthwith credited but when the wise of both sortes, as well clarkes as souldiers, had sifted her with manifold questions, she continued in her first speech so stedfastly uttering nothing but that which was modest, chast and holy that honour and faith was given unto her sayings. An old woman directed her. Joan armes herself like a man and requires to have that sword which hung at St. Katherine's Church at Fierbois in Touraine. This demand increased their admiration of her, for such a sword was found among the old donaries or votive tokens of that church. Thus warlikely arrayed she rides to Blois where forces and fresh victuals lay for the reliefe of Orleance. She with the Admiral and Marshal of France enters safe. This did greatly encourage the fainting French. Joan, the maide of God, so they called her (though some have written that it was a practise or imposture) writes then to de la Pole, Earle of Suffolke, who succeeded Salisbury in the maine charge of that siege.¹

After quoting the text of this well-known letter, Speed proceeds :

This letter was entertained by the English with laughter, and Joan reputed no better than a Bedlam or enchantresse, though to some it may seem more honourable to our nation that they were not to bee expelled by a humane power, but by a divine extraordinarily revealing itselfe. De Serres describes this paragon in these words : "She had a modest countenance sweet, civill and resolute. Her discourse was temperate, reasonable and retired. Her actions cold, shewing great chastity, without vanity, affectation, babling or courtly lightnesse." Let us not dissemble what we finde written. By her encouragements and conduct the English had Orleance pluckt out of their hopes, after they had suffered the Duke of Alanson to enter with new force and with much losse were driven to raise the siege. Joan herselfe was wounded in one sallie which she led, being shot through the arme with an arrow. Judge what she esteemed of that hurte, when she used these admirable and terrible words : "This is a favour : let us goe on. They cannot escape the hand of God." In all adventures she was one and foremost. . . . In memory of this admirable deliverance they of the City (of Orleans) erected a monument, where Charles VII., king of France, and Joan the martiall maide were represented kneeling in armour elevating their eyes and hands to heaven in sign of thankes and acknowledgment.²

After describing her capture, Speed finally concludes, evidently feeling the need of some sort of apology for the action of the English :

It is not to be doubted that the magnanimity of the English would have spared her, had they not found it necessary to deface

¹ Speed, *The History of Great Britaine*, London, 1611, p. 654.

² *Ibid.*, p. 655.

the opinion which the French even with superstition conceived of her.¹

As for Rapin de Thoyras, he does not by any means present an over-flattering portrait of the Maid. He rejects the two extreme hypotheses, that she was either a witch or an inspired saint, inclining strongly to the conclusion that "Joan's pretended inspiration may justly be deemed a contrivance to revive the courage of the terrified French." But in putting forward this opinion he discusses the matter in a supplementary Dissertation of many pages,² treating the question as a problem very difficult of solution, and by means of his summaries of Pasquier's volume making English readers for the first time acquainted with the substance of Joan's steadfast replies to her judges. In this way the book, as I venture to urge, exercised a more far-reaching and permanent influence upon English opinion than any extravagant panegyric could have done. The Dissertation inevitably provoked further inquiry, and it was enriched by the translator with an additional note derived from the manuscript remains of a certain Mr. de la Motte, Rector of Kettering, Northamptonshire. In this Englishmen were for the first time introduced to the problem of the false Joan of Arc, and Mr. de la Motte boldly urged the view that the Maid, by the connivance of Bishop Cauchon, was not really burnt at Rouen, but lived to marry at a later date and to become the ancestress of a great French family. Here, again, was matter provoking further inquiry into historical evidences, inquiry by which the noble character of Jeanne was bound to be seen in a clearer light notwithstanding all prejudices. If I may confess my own opinion, it was by such inquiry and by the dry logic of incontestable facts that English readers in the end learned to admire and revere the noble simplicity of her whom they had once regarded as a hypocrite and a sorceress. The view put forward by some of the critics mentioned above, notably by M. l'Abbé Haudecœur, is that the change in English feeling was due partly to the great personal admiration which the famous religious reformer, John Wesley, entertained for

¹ P. 656. Speed's more favourable view, however, did not at once carry English opinion with it. Thomas Fuller in the quaint account which he gives of Joan in his *Holy State* (1643), still treats her witchcraft and imposture as open questions. Indeed, it is in the character of a sorceress that she figures in his volume.

² In the copy before me, described on the title-page as the fourth edition, and published in London in 1757, the dissertation on Joan of Arc occupies twenty-three closely-printed octavo pages.

the Maid,¹ and partly to the sympathy felt in England for liberalistic principles during the early stages of the French Revolution. This is a theory which I find it hard to accept. Wesley was not a man, apart from his contributions to hymnology, whose influence was much felt in the domain of literature, neither were the party of Charles James Fox, or even the extreme followers of Tom Paine particularly interested in the problems of mediæval history. The simple truth, I take it, is that the average Englishman, though somewhat dull-witted and slow to change, is nevertheless essentially an advocate of fair-play when once the true facts have been brought home to him. This is what gradually took place during the four centuries which separated the age of Jeanne from the publication in full by Quicherat of the legal evidence upon which she was condemned. The true facts of her career were slowly, very slowly, sinking into the English mind, but now that full comprehension has been reached it may be said without fear of contradiction that nowhere in the world has the Blessed Jeanne d'Arc more enthusiastic and constant admirers than among that people of English speech against whom she so valiantly struggled.²

As was remarked above of Rapin de Thoyras, so it is true of Hume, whose *History of England*, however undeservedly, held the first place in English esteem for more than a century, that his detailed account of the career of the Maid was sufficiently sympathetic, despite his rationalism, to rouse admiration and to stimulate inquiry. Hume's work, which as a piece of historical narrative has rarely been surpassed in point of style, was read by all Englishmen of education in countless editions. The verdict which he passes is sufficiently summed up in the concluding words of the eighteen pages he devotes to her career :

She was condemned [he says] to be burned in the market place of Rouen and the infamous sentence was accordingly executed. This admirable heroine, to whom the more generous superstition of the ancients would have erected altars, was on pretence of heresy and magic, delivered over alive to the flames, and expiated by that dreadful

¹ John Wesley seems to have derived his impressions of the Maid from Guthrie's *History of England*, 1741. Guthrie and other Scotsmen had an inherited sympathy with the Armagnacs.

² The tone of a recent leading article in the *Times* (April 19, 1909) might be appealed to in proof of this.

punishment the signal services which she had rendered to her prince and to her native country.¹

As a result of the change of feeling thus gradually maturing we find in the closing years of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century that English appreciations of the Maid begin to take the form of separate books devoted entirely to her story. The earliest in point of time was the epic poem *Joan of Arc* published by Robert Southey in 1796, with some supplementary verses by Coleridge and elaborate historical foot-notes. Southey was a most industrious and able man of letters, but as a poet he hardly even attained a place in the second line. Still this epic in blank verse was several times reprinted, and although the action terminates with the coronation of Charles VII. at Rheims, the text and notes combined must have added very considerably to the slender store of knowledge upon the subject possessed by the average Englishman. Not long after Southey's poem there followed in 1812, a translation of the book of Lenglet du Fresnoy under the title of *Memoirs of Joan of Arc*; while in 1824, a more substantial work in two volumes illustrated, was published anonymously. It was called *Memoirs of Jeanne d'Arc surnamed La Pucelle*, and was for the most part a translation of Berriat St. Prix and other French authorities. The tone was entirely sympathetic to Jeanne, but the book must be prejudiced in the eyes of all modern readers by the fact that it was a piece of hack-work produced by the notorious W. H. Ireland who, when his impudent forgeries of pretended Shakespearean plays had made it impossible for him to live in England, had taken refuge upon the Continent and produced most of his literary work anonymously. As this unscrupulous person only two years before had published an English translation of the *Pucelle* of Voltaire, one can only hope that the later book was compiled with some idea of making reparation for the outrage thus inflicted on her memory.

Not less efficacious than these works in winning respect, if not enthusiasm, for the cause of the Maid was the tone adopted by the historians who in the first half of the nineteenth century enjoyed the greatest reputation in England. Amongst these Henry Hallam holds the highest place and, although the space which he devotes to the subject is not great, the verdict he pronounces is one which coming from such a man is really very

¹ Hume, *History of England* (Ed. 1820), vol. iii. p. 158.

remarkable. In his *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, first published in 1818, and afterwards reprinted in almost innumerable editions, the historian says :

At this time Charles VII.'s affairs were restored by one of the most marvellous revolutions in history. A country girl overthrew the power of England. We cannot pretend to explain the surprising story of the Maid of Orleans ; for however easy it may be to suppose that a heated and enthusiastic imagination produced her visions, it is a much greater problem to account for the credit they attained and for the success that attended her. Nor will this be solved by the hypothesis of a concerted stratagem ; which if we do not judge altogether from events, must appear liable to so many causes of failure that it could not have suggested itself to any rational person.

For one who weighs his words as carefully as Hallam, this is to say much. Neither is the judgment of such lesser historical lights as Sir N. Wraxall, Sir James Macintosh, and Mr. Sharon Turner less favourable. I cannot quote from all, but we may select the *History of England* of the last named, which went through several editions and is still deservedly esteemed. The writer seems just as much at a loss as Hallam to find any theory which can explain the facts to his satisfaction, while from the nature of his work the space devoted to the subject is in this case much more ample. His language is throughout sympathetic and respectful, and the account ends in the following climax :

So perished after a year's imprisonment and by an inhuman death this patriotic and heroic woman, or rather girl ; for she was scarcely twenty when she expired. No deliverer of a country has appeared who has merited a more liberal fame or achieved the great enterprise amid difficulties more arduous or with a purer disinterestedness than this noble-minded female.¹

It seems superfluous to insist upon the enthusiasm shown for Jeanne by such men of letters as Thomas de Quincey and Walter Savage Landor. The former was inspired to write an essay upon the subject of the Pucelle by reading Michelet's *Histoire de France*. The essay appeared in *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1847, and may count among the most characteristic productions of his genius. The caprice and waywardness of the writer are disastrously apparent in more than one wearisome passage, but there is hardly anything in English

¹ Sharon Turner, *History of England in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. p. 394. I quote from the fifth edition of the work. The first appeared as early as 1828.

prose literature finer than the last few pages. Walter Savage Landor at an earlier date than De Quincey has devoted one of his *Imaginary Conversations* to a dialogue between Jeanne d'Arc and Agnes Sorel, and the scene may be accounted one of the most successful in his volume. As any one will see who studies it carefully, the dialogue, though it takes some liberties with the facts of history, is characterized by deep pathos, and Landor shows himself to have been as devoted an admirer of Jeanne's generous character and exalted purity as any modern Catholic could be. Even Carlyle, despite his scant sympathy for visions and rapture, paid loyal homage to the Maid's singleness of purpose and to her efficiency. In his earliest separate work (1823) when discussing Schiller's great drama of the *Jungfrau von Orleans*, Carlyle rather goes out of his way to comment upon the character of the Maid, and he concludes his study in these words:

Who can tell the trials and the triumphs the splendours and the terrors, of which her simple spirit was the scene? "Heartless, sneering, God-forgetting French," as old Souwaroff called them—they are not worthy of their noble maiden. Hers were errors, but errors which a generous soul alone could have committed and which generous souls could have done more than pardon. Her darkness and delusions were of the understanding only; but they make the radiance of her heart more touching and apparent, as clouds are gilded by the orient light into something more beautiful than azure itself.¹

It would be tedious to multiply similar appreciations from other representative leaders of English thought. From the early years of the nineteenth century down to the present time it would be difficult to find one single English historical writer who speaks disparagingly of Jeanne or who fails even to show enthusiasm for her mighty achievement. Strange to say, of all the historians of note, it is perhaps Lingard, the Catholic, who speaks most grudgingly. Except for the fact that he does not insinuate that the Maid's preternatural visitations were suggested to her by her confessor or the clergy, Lingard's conception of her character approximated in many respects to that lately given to the world by M. Anatole France. It seems not improbable that the Catholic historian was unconsciously influenced in his presentment of the character by the sense that any too ready acceptance of a miraculous element in her career would at once be pounced upon by unfriendly Protestant

¹ Carlyle, *Life of Schiller*, p. 183, (Works, vol. v).

critics and taken as evidence of the writer's superstition and consequent untrustworthiness in all matters in which Catholic feeling could be evoked. Moreover it must not be forgotten that Lingard wrote before 1820, *i.e.* before any strong English feeling had yet grown up in favour of the Maid. The cult, if we may so describe the movement which has so strongly influenced English opinion in her favour, was at that epoch confined only to a few enthusiasts. The majority of Englishmen were then not exactly hostile or ungenerous, but indifferent.

Perhaps no more convenient test could be furnished of the progress made in the appreciation of Jeanne's career by the English reading-public than that which may be derived from a perusal of the articles consecrated to Joan of Arc in the successive editions of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In the second edition, published in 1780, we find only the following brief notice:

Joan of Arc is the Maid of Orleans whose heroic behaviour in reanimating the expiring valour of the French nation, though by the most superstitious means (pretending to be inspired), deserved a better fate. She was burnt by the English as a sorceress in 1431, aged twenty-four.¹

Down to the seventh edition, published in 1842, this notice remained almost without modification, and even in that year, though the account was about doubled in length, the tone was not more sympathetic. For example we are told:

To accomplish her object, she pretended to be inspired, and in her character of prophetess as well as heroine succeeded in infusing new energy into her countrymen. But her enemies were not deceived as to her real character; they regarded her merely as a bold and successful impostor, and accordingly when she fell into their hands they put her to death.²

Less than a dozen years later the eighth edition of the *Encyclopaedia* appeared, and there we find a notice of Jeanne which is ten times the length of any that preceded. The spirit of the article will be gathered from the following extract:

Her unjust and cruel death was an indelible stigma upon the character of her prosecutors. Charles VII. did nothing towards avenging her cause, but contented himself with procuring the reversion of the process. . . . A consistent and uniform judgment concerning

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Edinburgh, 1780, vol. v. p. 3923.

² *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Seventh Edition, 1842, vol. xii. p. 587.

the actions and address of this personage cannot be made by posterity. That she gave herself up to the influence of a heated fancy, and that she was confident in the idea of her divine inspiration, and that this emotion was so improved by certain favourites of Charles as to excite the emotions of the public, seems to be the more probable supposition.¹

The ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia* appeared between 1876 and 1891, and it has not yet been superseded. In this edition, the article "Joan of Arc" is nearly twice as long as that just quoted, and is furnished with a tolerably full bibliography. But what is especially remarkable is the change of tone. We could not reasonably expect anything more appreciative from an agnostic or non-Catholic writer than what we find in this sketch of the Maid and her work, even though opinions might differ considerably as to the correctness of some of the statements made in it.

Joan [the writer says] possessed a shrewd and penetrating judgment both as to men and things, and the manner in which she conducted herself amid the varied difficulties of her career indicated extraordinary force of character, and high and noble prudence.

The article terminates with the following appreciation which deserves to be quoted in full.

There is no doubt that Joan herself believed in her supernatural guidance, and her judges notwithstanding all their efforts, were unable to bring to light the smallest semblance of a sign of conscious dishonesty on her part. At the same time the nobility of her purpose was unstained by the faintest symptom of selfish regard for her own fame and glorification. Indeed the greatness of her career did not consist in her military achievements, but in her pure, true, and ardent character, which made her a pathetic victim to the mean and grovelling aims of those in whose cause she fought with such simple sincerity of faith and to the cruelties of a superstitious age.

Passing over a number of excellent English biographies of the Maid, such for example as those of Mrs. Bray (1874), Miss Janet Tuckey (1880), and Lord Ronald Gower (1893), we may note that it is above all since the year 1894, when by the formal introduction of the Process, Jeanne d'Arc acquired the right to be styled the Venerable Servant of God, that the cult of the Maid in English-speaking countries has reached its highest development. Among all the non-Catholic champions of the

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eighth Edition, vol. i. pp. 399—400, s. v. ARC.

Pucelle, the first place as almost every English reader is aware, belongs to Mr. Andrew Lang, whose ardour in her cause is only equalled by the range and accuracy of his acquaintance with the details of her history. As far back as the year 1894, Mr. Lang had already published a most sympathetic little poem in her honour, and in an article in *Macmillan's Magazine* he had conveyed the impression that he fully accepted the preternatural character of her Voices. Thus he had written :

As to the nature of her Voices we have nothing to say. It is absolutely certain that the prophecy of her wound at Orleans was made and was recorded in a despatch from a Flemish Ambassador three weeks before it occurred. She had, therefore, reason to trust her premonitions, but they never made her shun a fight.¹

Since then Mr. Lang has never ceased to champion the cause of the *Bienheureuse* with a chivalrous devotion worthy of the Maid's own loyalty to her sovereign. Both in the daily and weekly press as well as in magazines of a more weighty character such as the *Scottish Historical Review* and the *Contemporary Review* he has drawn attention to her mission and to her gifts and has defended her against attack. In particular, as has already been pointed out in these pages, he has criticized the recent work of M. Anatole France with an acumen, a precision and a relentless logic which have been rivalled by no one of the Maid's Catholic defenders. To attempt a list of all that Mr. Lang has written upon the subject would be difficult, for many of his articles are of an ephemeral and fugitive character, but he has recently set the crown upon all his previous work by a most careful biography published under the title of *The Maid of France*, the thoroughness and accuracy of which have been attested by nearly all its English reviewers. We have no room for long quotations, but as a specimen of much that is truthfully and beautifully written in the book we quote these sentences from its first page.

Jeanne d'Arc was the consummation and ideal of two noble human efforts towards perfection. The peasant's daughter was the Flower of Chivalry, brave, gentle, merciful, courteous, kind and loyal. Later poets and romance-writers delighted to draw the figure of the lady-knight; but Spenser and Ariosto could not create, Shakespeare could not imagine, such a being as Jeanne d'Arc.

She was the most perfect daughter of her Church; to her its

¹ *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. lxx. p. 74; 1894.

sacraments were the very Bread of Life ; her conscience, by frequent confession, was kept fair and pure as the lilies of Paradise. In a tragedy without parallel or precedent the Flower of Chivalry died for France and the Chivalry of France which had deserted her, she died by the Chivalry of England which shamefully entreated and destroyed her ; while the most faithful of Christians perished through the "Celestial science" and dull political hatred of priests who impudently called themselves "the Church."

Mr. Andrew Lang has striven to make known the glory of his heroine not only in serious articles and more ephemeral paragraphs, but also in children's books and in the realm of fiction. His novel, *The Monk of Fife*, has been widely read, and has not been without its effect upon many thousands of that more frivolous reading-public who can hardly be persuaded to take up a serious history.

For analogous reasons it seems right to mention in the next place to Mr. Lang a famous American writer and humorist, Mr. S. L. Clemens, better known under his literary pseudonym of "Mark Twain." Mark Twain, so far as I am aware, has written but one book which has any relation to Jeanne d'Arc, and that is thrown into the shape of certain fictitious memoirs left for posterity by a supposed contemporary. None the less, this one book has been so widely read upon both sides of the Atlantic by thousands of eager admirers that we cannot but trace to its inspiration a great deal of the extraordinary enthusiasm for the Maid which may now often be found existing even in the most unlikely quarters. "Mark Twain" carries his admiration for the Pucelle to a point which might almost seem strained and extravagant when extracts are read apart from their setting. But of the author's sincerity there can be no question, and humorist as he is, there is not the faintest shade of mockery in such dithyrambs as the following passage from the Preface :

The character of Joan of Arc is unique. It can be measured by the standards of all times without misgiving or apprehension as to the result. Judged by any of them, indeed by all of them, it is still flawless, it is still ideally perfect ; it still occupies the loftiest place possible to human attainment, a loftier one than has been reached by any other mere mortal. . . .

The contrast between her and her century was the contrast between day and night. She was truthful, when lying was the common speech of men ; she was honest, when honesty was become a lost virtue ; she was a keeper of promises, when the keeping of a promise was expected

of no one; she gave her great mind to great thoughts and great purposes when other great minds wasted themselves upon pretty fancies or upon poor ambitions; she was modest and fine and delicate when to be loud and coarse might be said to be universal; she was full of pity when a merciless cruelty was the rule; she was steadfast when stability was unknown and honourable in an age which had forgotten what honour was.

She was perhaps the only entirely unselfish person whose name has a place in profane history. No vestige or suggestion of self-seeking can be found in any word or deed of hers. When she had rescued her King from his vagabondage, and set his crown upon his head, she was offered rewards and honours but she refused them all and would take nothing.

Of a more serious and scientific American book, Mr. Francis Lowell's *Life of Joan of Arc*, the most scholarly biography in English down to the appearance of Mr. Andrew Lang's work, I have no space to speak: nor can I touch upon the translation of the Procès by Mr. T. D. Murray (1902 and 1907), which has also been very influential in directing attention to the beautiful character of the French heroine. But as one illustration of the tone which is now beginning to prevail even in our ordinary English histories, I should like to find room for a brief extract from Mr. Oman's contribution to the *Political History of England* recently published by Messrs. Longman:

Robert de Baudricourt, prévôt de Vaucouleurs, was at first inclined to laugh at the presumption of the poor peasant girl; but, like all who came into personal contact with Jeanne, he yielded ere long to the ascendancy of her piety, her earnestness and her transparent honesty. She was wholly illiterate, but her language was always correct and well chosen as if some higher intelligence inspired her peasant tongue . . .

The rest of the Maid's short tale is heart-rending. . . . History records few more odious scenes than the martyrdom of this unhappy and heroic girl of eighteen, the victim of Bedford's hard heart and the cruel spite of his French subordinates. Yet of all concerned in her death her master Charles VII. cuts the worst figure; he made no attempt whatever to deliver her, though he could undoubtedly have saved her life by threatening to retaliate on his numerous English prisoners—he had still in his hands Lord Talbot and many knights and nobles captured at Jargeau and Patay. But Jeanne had served her purpose and the French court felt no further interest in her.¹

Mr. Oman's *History*, like the other volumes of the series, has no religious colouring, but the tone of more distinctly Anglican

¹ Oman, *History of England from Richard II. to Richard III.* London, 1906, pp. 303 and 316.

writers, as was to be expected, is not less full of appreciation for the Maid's sublime character. I may refer for justification of this remark to an article which appeared in October, 1903, in the *Church Quarterly Review*. The following short extract is but a specimen of much that is beautifully written with the deepest sense of religious veneration for the person of the Maid.

Strange indeed that so pure and lofty a life should ever have been forgotten, tragic that it should have been befouled. But time's rehabilitation is complete. The pure heroic figure, whose saintliness matches her courage, stands out without fear and without reproach, the greatest heroine of France, and perhaps among the greatest, or certainly among the most beautiful, figures that the history of the world has to show.

Finally, it may be permissible to point out that while so much has been done for the glory of the Maid by those who do not share the Christian faith which was so dear to her, our English Catholics on their side have not been idle. Elaborate studies or profound original research on this side of the Channel have been rendered superfluous by the splendid work of so many French scholars of distinction, but there is at present no saint or personage in history whose story has been told of recent years in so many excellent Catholic Lives for English readers as that of the Bienheureuse Jeanne d'Arc. Father Wyndham, Mr. Justice O'Hagan, the Hon. Mrs. Maxwell Scott, Lady Amabel Kerr, and M. Anthony, have all published careful and sympathetic biographies—not to speak of the translation of M. Petit de Julleville's sketch in the series *Les Saints*. If any Catholic is insufficiently acquainted with the career of the Maid, the fault cannot be ascribed to the lack of an adequate supply of literature, whilst there is probably not one amongst us who is not eager, so far as in him lies, to atone for the outrages and the calumnies of our forefathers, saluting in profoundest veneration this paragon of pure and constant womanhood, whom the Church has at last raised to the honours of the altar.¹

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ The Blessed Jeanne d'Arc has also been a source of inspiration to English Art, and I may venture to call attention here to a very beautiful statuette, with some medals and badges, which have been recently produced in commemoration of the Maid by the Bromsgrove Guild.

The Salford Diocesan Catholic Federation.

[As readers of the Hon. Charles Russell's interesting account of the Catholic Federation of London in *THE MONTH* for April may perhaps conclude that the movement is organized in exactly similar fashion wherever else it is established in the country, we are glad to be able to publish a statement of the aims and working of the Federation as it exists in an important diocese in the North, precisely because the Salford Federation differs in many important respects from the London. A comparison of the two descriptions will thus show how the same general principles can be put into operation, and worked with success on dissimilar lines according to the needs and circumstances of each locality.—Ed.]

IT has been said that no movement can be permanently successful unless it is built upon a public opinion thoroughly satisfied of the need for it; it is certainly true to say that the Catholic Federation can never be permanently successful until it is built upon a Catholic opinion thoroughly satisfied of the need for a Catholic Federation. From the beginning of the movement people have asked, and will continue to ask: "How far does the Federation partake of the nature of a political party, and how far will it make it difficult for me to hold my political opinions?" This is a straight question demanding a straight answer, and the success of the movement depends, to some extent, at least, upon a satisfactory answer being provided.

"How far does the Federation partake of the nature of a political party?" In the first place, the Federation claims to be a Catholic movement, and any movement, to be Catholic, must possess that spirit of comprehensiveness which characterizes the Church herself. The different schools of political thought which are acceptable to the Church must likewise be acceptable to the Federation, and the members of those schools who are to be found in the Church, will likewise be found in the ranks of the Federation. Are any of those doctrines of Conservatism, Liberalism, Labourism, and Irish Nationalism which are admitted by the Church, to be banned by the

Federation? The question only needs asking to answer itself. But, to put the matter clearer, we might ask another question: What would be thought of any of the great political parties of this country—the Liberal Party for instance—if it were to urge its members to belong to one of the other parties? Yet this is precisely the line the Federation takes! The Federation does not aim at dictating the political convictions of its members, but, on the contrary, says to them: If you hold political opinions, get inside the particular party which advocates those opinions; enter that party, not as a Catholic, but as a citizen, and act with it, heart and soul, unless and until that party makes it impossible for you by introducing questions which are hostile to Catholic principles. Then the Federation expects you to run up the Catholic flag, to rally your co-religionists in your party under that flag, to fight the opponents of Catholicism inside your party, and, if necessary, to vote against your party at the poll. Taking the Catholic Labour man as an illustration, we find him fighting against Secular Education and Revolutionary Socialism inside his party for the last three years, and, when necessary, voting against his party. Yet he knows that the Labour Party is bound to justify its existence by working whole-heartedly for those Social Reforms—in many cases they are merely the ordinary decencies of life—which he needs so much. But he also knows, that although Catholicism in the twentieth century does not ask Catholics to make sacrifice of their lives in amphitheatres, it asks them to make sacrifices in a very matter-of-fact, unromantic way. It is still asking him, Can he drink the Chalice? And he is aware that it is still expecting him to answer the question in the affirmative, even when that question is put in the prosaic form of asking him to vote against his party.

If, then, those schools of political thought which are acceptable to the Church are also acceptable to the Federation, it is also necessary to show that the members of those schools are actually members of the Federation. Otherwise, we might lay ourselves open to the charge that we are confining ourselves to theory. If we take as an illustration the composition of the Manchester, Salford, and District Committee of the Federation—which is the legislative body for that district—we shall find that the three hundred and fifty delegates may be grouped as follows: (a) Irish Nationalists, which is the largest group, consisting of Irishmen born and reared in Ireland, or of

Irishmen of the second and third generation who, perhaps, have never seen Ireland, but who hold the principle of Irish Nationalism with conviction ; (b) Liberal Group, about equal in point of numbers with (c) Labour or Trade-Union Group ; (d) Conservative Group, which is the smallest ; and (e) the Non-Political Group, the number of which it is difficult to estimate ; it consists of men and women whose political views are not sufficiently pronounced to justify their being labelled, and includes the major portion of the clergy. The existence of these diverse political elements inside the legislative body is sufficient proof that the Federation does not partake, in any sense, of the nature of a political party, and indicates most clearly that religion is its sole bond of union. The impossibility of imagining any political creed which could hold that legislative body together for twenty-four hours is obvious enough, and it is still more obvious that any body which partakes of the nature of a political party must also possess something in the nature of a political creed. Hence the Federation not only is not, but cannot be, political. When the Federation is prepared to propagate political principles—however desirable those principles may be in themselves—which it is not the duty of the Church to propagate, then at that particular moment the Federation partakes of the nature of a political party. At that particular moment, also, the Federation ceases to be a Catholic movement. The *Manchester Guardian*, during the November elections of 1907, said: "We deprecate the formation of political parties upon religious lines." So does the Federation. It went on to say :

But we do consider that religious bodies are exercising their proper functions when they enter into political contests with the object of preventing certain religious principles from being trampled under the feet of the combatants.

That description will serve the Federation very well.

We have effectively interfered upon those grounds, and they are the only grounds which justify our interference. If political parties do not desire our entry into political contests, they have the remedy in their own hands by ceasing to menace Catholic interests. The Federation has other work to accomplish, and it is anxious to proceed with it as soon as political parties make it possible for it to do so.

To come now to our second question—"How far will the

Federation make it difficult for me to hold my political opinions?" Again taking the position of the Catholic Labour man as an illustration—What is his difficulty? He finds, we may suppose, an apparent difficulty in reconciling his Labour principles with his Catholic principles. If the principles his party advocates are obviously opposed to his Catholic principles, he is bound to leave his party. But the policy of any political party, at given times, may be out of harmony with the principles of that party. The party may have got into the hands of a clique, who are pushing, not the principles of their party, but their own particular fads: the propaganda of those fads thus becoming the policy of the party at that particular time. This is the present position of the Labour Party, and the position which is occupied by most political parties at some time or other in the course of their history. Of course if the obnoxious policy has become by lapse of time so thoroughly identified with the party programme as to make its removal a practical impossibility, the Catholic member of the party occupies the position that he would occupy if that policy were a principle of the party. But until that position is demonstrated, the Catholic is justified in remaining inside his party and attempting to upset the policy. That is the existing difficulty of the Catholic Labour man. But that difficulty has not been created by the Catholic Federation. The difficulty has been created by people inside his own party, and the Federation says to him: "The difficulty already existing, we offer to you the Federation which will provide you with opportunities for consultation with your fellow-Catholic, who is in the same position as yourself, and will thus make both of you better able to surmount that difficulty. We have not made it difficult for you to hold your political principles, but, if you are prepared to stand by your Catholic principles, we shall provide you with encouragement and inspiration to do so. That difficulty only exists on the assumption—surely warranted—that you are prepared to stand by your Catholic principles. If you are not prepared to do so, you have, of course, removed the difficulty yourself." What is true of the Catholic inside the Labour Party, is true of the Catholic inside any party, and thus the Federation cannot make it difficult for a Catholic to hold his political opinion.

The principle and policy of the Federation, therefore, is the promotion and defence of Catholic interests whenever and

wherever those interests need promoting or defending, and, so far as they have any relationship to political parties, the permeating of those parties, not with Catholicism, but with Catholics. It becomes, therefore, if not essential, at least advisable that its members should belong to different political organizations, as far as it is possible for them as Catholics to do so.

Another and more fundamental question remains,—Does the Church in this country require an organization? If we examine the condition of Catholicism in those countries where it is publicly organized, as in Germany, Belgium, and the United States, we shall find that Catholicism fully holds its own, but if we turn to a country like France, where Catholicism is not publicly organized, we shall find that it can make no headway against its foes. Indeed, French Catholics would appear to be learning to-day that at least half their troubles arise from their lack of unity in front of the enemy, and, antecedently, from their lack of public organization. Is it a mere coincidence that Catholicism should be successful where Catholicism is publicly organized, and should not be successful where it is not publicly organized? It is the providential lot of the Church to which we belong to find mighty forces always arrayed against her: forces against which her children must defend themselves. Our aim is defence, not defiance, but we must be effectually organized before we can effectively defend. Surely the education crisis should teach us that it is not wise to wait to train our forces until the crisis comes upon us. We shall be stating the obvious, when we say that Catholic interests demand the formation of one organization, which will gather together the Catholic forces for the promotion and defence of those interests whenever they are unjustifiably attacked by anti-Catholic or non-Catholic forces; an organization which will unite individuals as well as associations, without destroying the individuality of the latter; an organization which will feed all associations and be fed by them; an organization which will demand no more from its members than the word Catholic demands; an organization which will know no distinction of party, class, or sex; an organization which will permanently retain that recently awakened spirit which prompted Catholics to act boldly, promptly, and unitedly in defence of their schools.

This organization we already possess in the Diocesan Federation, and here we propose to examine briefly its

constitution and the different ways in which it has rendered service. And first, as to its action. In the autumn before Mr. Birrell's Bill passed the Commons, the Catholics of the Salford diocese felt it incumbent upon them to make a protest. At once we felt the advantage of possessing machinery which was merely waiting to be put into motion. A suggestion from our Bishop, a recommendation by the Executive, a decision by the District Committee, and we were at once able to penetrate to every corner of the diocese, and set every parish actively at work through the instrumentality of the branch secretaries. The same advantage was realized, and the same process was followed, when the need arose for demonstrating our sympathy for our co-religionists in France; when we organized, within three days of the decision of the Archbishop and Bishops on the Runciman Bill, a protest meeting in every parish in the diocese, and towns' meetings in Manchester and Blackburn, and had the opinions of those meetings placed directly in the hands of His Majesty's Ministers and Members of the House of Commons; when we took fifteen hundred Lancashire men and women to the Eucharistic Congress, and, after standing the racket of Rochester Row, brought them all back more convinced of the need for the Federation than ever they were; and when we took many of the same working men and women on the pilgrimage to Rome to familiarize them with that centre of unity which stands at the back of all Federations.

One of the great obstacles to our progress in the past has been our failure to realize that we have been too parochial. Every Catholic will naturally take a proper pride in his own parish. To preach against that would be like preaching patriotism and forgetting to be patriotic to one's own hearthstone. But pride in one's own parish is consistent with pride in the progress of the Church in another parish. We have acted as if we were oblivious of the existence and welfare of other parishes, and the Church has not gained by such action. Unity, and the forces which make for unity, have been hampered and impeded by the narrowness of the parochial spirit. The Federation is breaking down those unfortunate barriers, and there are few delegates whose views have not been broadened and whose opportunities for making the acquaintance of their fellow-Catholics have not been increased since the introduction of the movement. One of the most pleasing features of the past, and one of the surest guarantees of success in the future,

is the manner in which priest and layman have differed in opinion, without either resenting the right of the other to differ. If we are to present that united front which is so essential to success, we shall do it no less effectively because we have learned in District Committee our lesson of mutual forbearance and mutual goodwill. So far as it was desirable, it was inevitable that parochial idols should be overthrown and narrow parochial ideas exploded, but it has been done without that friction and division which timid souls always expect. It will be remembered that friction has sometimes arisen in the past whenever two or three parishes have been concerned in one electoral area. They have not agreed as to the particular man to whom they should give their united support. The strong parish has succeeded in forcing its will upon the weaker parishes, and the inevitable resentment has resulted. This has been owing to the absence of an authoritative body which could hold the scales between the parishes concerned. The problem before the Federation was—How to preserve the authority of the general movement without interfering unduly with the autonomy of the branch? We decided that in cases of friction, the delegates of the branch or branches concerned should be associated with the Executive for that particular purpose; they could debate and decide; but the common decision was to be binding upon all concerned. We have thus set up a body which can speak with authority; one whose decision will be more readily accepted by the branches because they themselves have helped to arrive at the decision.

Turning to the organization, we begin with the branch. The branch area is co-extensive with the parochial area. Every Catholic in the parish over sixteen years of age is eligible for membership, and no further qualification is asked than is implied by the word Catholic. It is at the branch meeting that the members exercise their right to discuss every rule of the Federation and express their opinion upon it before it becomes law, and the name of every official in the movement must be submitted to them before he can be elected. They elect the six delegates who, together with the Rector or his clerical nominee, will represent them on the District Committee, and every Catholic representative or member of a governing body who desires Catholic support must first receive the approval of the branch. In this way are recognized the responsibilities and privileges of every parishioner. The branch is authorized to affiliate to

itself, in accordance with the regulations provided by the Federation, every other Catholic association in the parish. By this means the branch becomes the common meeting ground for the individuals and associations in the parish, and thus becomes a great centre of unity and source of support. It is the business of the branch to take a survey of the parish, claiming a vote for every parishioner entitled to it, and securing registration of it, collecting the subscriptions of those parishioners who are Federationists, and urging non-Federationists to join the movement. It carries on the work of the Literary and Debating Sections by holding Lectures, Debates, &c., and distributes Catholic literature in a cheap and popular form. It organizes the Catholic Trade-Unionists in its own area, and acts as local agent for the District Executive for all purposes.

We will ask our readers to accompany the branch delegates to the District Committee, which meets monthly. The area of the District is co-extensive with the Deanery, and, in the case of Manchester and Salford, includes all branches in the deaneries in the Manchester and Salford District. It consists of fifty rectors and three hundred laymen and laywomen representing fifty branches, and knows no distinction of class, party, or sex. Its sole passport is: "A Catholic, elected by Catholics!" It is the legislative body, asserting its rights, under the Bishop, to be supreme in Federation matters, and possesses the power of affiliating Catholic Associations whose areas are co-extensive with its own.

The District Committee administers its affairs through an Executive, meeting monthly, and composed of its own officials, plus the Chairman of permanent Sub-Committees and the Registration Agents of Registration Sub-Committees, together with clergy and laity elected from its own body. The proportion of clergy and laity, right through the Federation, always being as one is to three. This Executive possesses two Sub-Committees dealing with "Finance" and "Organization."

The District Committee delegates different branches of its work to Sub-Committees, meeting monthly, which are as follows:

The Education Sub-Committee consists of six parents, six school-managers, six representatives of local authorities all elected from the District Committee; and six teachers elected from the Catholic Teachers' Guild. It is necessary to note the representative character of that Committee. Eighteen of its

members are by training and practical experience familiar with the working of the education machinery through which the attacks on the Catholic schools are made. Then the Committee brings the Catholic parent into closer contact with the teacher and the Manager, it creates in him a greater interest in education affairs, with the result that his influence will be felt more frequently in those affairs, in the formation of the education authority, and the exercise of his inalienable rights. The need for this Committee will not be removed by the settlement of the Education Question. Our Irish readers will be aware that the spirit in which Irish laws are administered is often quite as evil as the laws themselves; similarly in Education matters we must always be prepared for difficulties of administration. For our part, we found the best justification of the existence of this committee in the statement which was presented, through one of its chief spokesmen, to the District Committee upon the occasion of the introduction of the McKenna Bill, and we would ask, from what source before the existence of the Federation, could the parent have been placed in full possession of all the facts about that Bill twenty-four hours after it had been introduced? Parents attending any branch meeting are now finding it possible, not merely to question the suitability of some of the prizes which their children are receiving from the education authority, but also to have the matter referred to this Committee for enquiry and report. It has appointed experts to reply through the Press to the attacks made upon the Catholic schools, and has made its influence felt in the Board of Education itself. It can inform Catholic parents as to the positions open to their children in the civil and municipal services, the examinations necessary, and the most suitable schools to attend for preparation. It can point out any dangers that may be concealed in any proposed educational legislation, and it can render assistance to Catholic representatives by supplying them with information.

The Trade Union Sub-Committee, meeting monthly, consists of one delegate from each branch, who must also be a delegate to the District Committee. The latter provision applies to all Sub-Committees. The Catholic Trade-Unionist has already found the need of preventing the Labour Party and the Trade Union Movement from adopting educational and economic systems, which he, in conscience, could not accept. He found himself, also, compelled to pay for the support of representatives who were deliberately trying to bring about the

adoption of those systems. His opponents were well organized ; he had no organization. Through the medium of this Committee, he was able to start an agitation, after the Belfast Conference, which was carried on from Conference to Congress and from Congress to Conference ; he was able to co-operate with his colleagues in every part of the diocese ; and, finally, he was able to meet Catholic Trade-Unionists from different parts of England in the conference held at St. Bede's College—the first conference of Catholic Trade-Unionists that we have hitherto known. His agitation has resulted in the Secularist being unable to gain one inch of ground since the opposition started ; the vote against Secularism has increased year by year and he has assisted in compelling the Socialist to adopt an opportunist policy towards his own Socialism. The Catholic Trade-Unionist is now in possession of machinery which will inspire and encourage him in the battle of the future. This Committee also keeps a register of all the Catholic Trade-Unionists in its area, compiled from the registers kept by the branch secretaries.

The Registration Sub-Committees are three in number : Manchester, Salford, and Eccles, each possessing its own registration agent attending the revision courts. It is responsible for the efficient registration of every Catholic voter in the area, and, at times of election, controls the machinery by which the will of the District Committee is carried into effect. It supervises, through its divisional captains, the registration work in each branch, and in many cases, its workers assist in enrolling members and collecting subscriptions. These Committees are composed of two delegates from each branch, and this Committee—like other Committees—expects those delegates to represent particularly its own department of registration in each branch. It is the work of this Committee to provide branches with all the literature and information which they require in connection with registration, and to co-ordinate the work of the branches at head-quarters. The importance of this Committee cannot be exaggerated, as it is the medium by which the activities of the Federation are focussed, when necessary, at the ballot-box. One of the advantages of this work being performed by the Federation lies in the fact that the knowledge of registration possessed by a particular branch is thus placed at the disposal of the whole movement.

The Literary and Debating Sub-Committee, meeting

monthly, is composed of one delegate from each branch. It is based upon the principle that it is the first business of a minority to get itself understood, and that it can only do so by providing its members with the machinery by which they can cultivate the faculty of expression. It believes that the Catholic case will gain by being presented to the public by the layman, and not by the priest alone, and it is endeavouring to produce an active and intelligent laity. It is its first duty to receive the Catholic case from the hands of the authorities, and convey it to the people in a popular form. It works by means of a monthly debate or lecture, held at the centre, and a weekly debate or lecture held in each branch. It is the work of this Committee to popularize Catholic Literature by distributing same through the District Committee and the Branch.

The District Committee of Manchester and Salford has its counterpart in the different deaneries of the diocese. These Committees elect Clerical and lay representatives to a Diocesan Council with the Bishop at its head. It is a court to which branches may appeal, under certain contingencies, against a decision of a district. It is the organizing force, because it exercises a general supervision over the organization in the area of Federation, it co-ordinates its component parts; and it affiliates all associations whose area is co-extensive with, or, pending the formation of a confederation, greater than its own. It is important to note that the Diocesan Council has passed upon the initiative of a District Committee, the following rule:

Provided always that no branch, nor district committee, nor diocesan council, shall in any way interfere in parochial administration, or in matters having reference, directly or indirectly, to ecclesiastical discipline.

The question of confederation is a question for the future, but the Salford Federation will always assist every endeavour in that direction. It believes in the confederating of all federations and the affiliation of all associations, because it believes that wherever general apathy prevails, every federation and association must suffer; whilst a confederation which will stimulate general interest among Catholics must have a beneficial effect upon every federation and association.

This is not the time, nor are we the men, neither is it the business of any one man, to outline the Federation's future. It

is sufficient to say that its possibilities are unbounded. While present-day federationists must allow the movement to have sufficient freedom to adapt itself to the needs of the Church as they arise, they must also steer it carefully down a purely Catholic channel : never allowing it to deviate a hair's-breadth from those Catholic principles which it has been called upon to advocate and defend : never allowing it to outrage its own spirit of true democracy by refusing to hearken to the responsible voices of those who alone can make federation, and confederation, possible. The Federation can become a great moral agency, and there are many in the movement, priests and laymen, who have waited too long for the Federation to be easily deterred by any difficulties which might present themselves : priests and laymen, who are prepared to give of their best in building up a successful Catholic organization.

(REV.) T. SHARROCK } *Secretaries.*
T. F. BURNS }

Some of Nature's Whims.

"FAUNISTS," observes Gilbert White,¹ "are too apt to acquiesce in bare descriptions and a few synonyms;—the reason is plain, because all that may be done at home in a man's study; but the investigation of the life and conversation of animals is a concern of much more trouble and difficulty, and is not to be attained but by the active and inquisitive, and by those who reside much in the country."

No one will attempt to deny that, as it stands, the reproach thus addressed to "faunists" has now been entirely removed, and by many it will doubtless be dismissed with indignation, as being undeserving of a moment's thought. To say that zoologists of the present day are content with bare descriptions and a few synonyms would be preposterous, for have they not devoted themselves with infinite labour and industry to examine every most minute particular of the animal kingdom, so that there is no creature, great or small, in regard of which full and accurate information cannot be freely supplied to all who desire to become acquainted with its structure and functions, as well as its place in the chain of life? There seems, nevertheless, to be some ground for the complaint of "the old gardener naturalist," as he has been disparagingly styled, and a good deal more may be said on his side than might at first appear.

Undoubtedly—though of course there are notable exceptions—"faunists," as he calls them, usually pursue their investigations, if not in their studies, yet in laboratories and museums, and give comparatively little attention to the fields and woods, and what may there be observed; they seem even to consider that no knowledge can claim to be truly scientific which is not based primarily on structural or anatomical details, in regard of which the creature studied is treated almost exclusively on the mechanical side, and little or no

¹ To Daines Barrington, August 1, 1771.

interest is exhibited as to the living animal itself, and the use to which it puts the varied apparatus with which it is furnished. It is of course very easy to exaggerate in such a matter, and, as has already been acknowledged, there are many, and brilliant, exceptions to the general rule, but without going so far as those who do not hesitate to declare that many distinguished ornithologists would be puzzled to recognize a thrush if they saw one, or heard his song, though they could without a moment's hesitation identify his skeleton, there can be little doubt that a president of the Royal Microscopical Society spoke but the bare truth when he complained, some years ago,¹ that the authors of many scientific memoirs and monographs generally spend their main space and strength in examining the shape and structure of their animals, and in comparing one with another, but giving the most meagre details of their lives and habits. Not only, as the same authority insists, is the more interesting topic thus omitted, but moreover one without notice of which the treatment cannot be considered "scientific," a term which is practically restricted to the bearing of any subject on the great question of Evolution. It is undoubtedly by means of comparative anatomy, and recognition of the fundamental likenesses discoverable under most various forms, that biologists have been led to believe that such forms must trace their origin to one and the same ancestor, a conclusion which is no doubt strikingly suggested by many details of structure and functions. It will hardly be pretended, however, that the life-histories of animals, of themselves, would produce a like impression, or be held to teach the same lesson. The field observer will rather find that he is constantly confronted by phenomena for which he cannot even imagine any explanation, and that he has to fall back on the conviction that there has been Evolution, as described by Darwinians and others, in order to satisfy himself that it must account for what he actually sees. That the doctrine of Evolution would ever have been actually discovered by investigation of living nature, will scarcely be maintained: rather, what is found in the realm of life has largely to be explained away to make it accord with evolutionary requirements.

Nobody, for example, could suppose that the complex process through which, as Darwin maintained, the architectural

¹ Dr. Hudson, "On some needless difficulties in the study of Natural History," *Nature*, February 20, 1896.

skill of the hive-bee may be supposed to have been developed from a wild, inartistic progenitor, could ever have led men to suppose that such development had actually taken place. On the contrary, he himself had to acknowledge that, being most anxious to show this to be possible, he was driven "half-mad" in the endeavour to find an explanation which seemed plausible.¹

There is no lack of instances, albeit less familiar, which confront us with similar problems, and in which we cannot pretend even to construct a specious theory which shall account for the genesis of instincts or habits found operative in nature, and in which the explanations usually given by evolutionists are very far from bringing conviction.

Such, for example, is the case of the "mound birds," the Australian Megapodes and Brush Turkeys, specimens of which are to be found acclimatized in the Duke of Bedford's park at Woburn Abbey, where they exhibit their most peculiar nesting habits as at the Antipodes. These birds depend for the incubation of their eggs upon the heat generated by fermenting vegetable matter, of which for this purpose they accumulate a mass at the spot selected for the purpose, walking backwards kicking behind them and scraping together grass and leaves, mingled with soil, in the likeness of a heap of garden refuse. On so large a scale is the work done, that a pair of Megapodes, no larger than Dorking fowls, have been known in successive years, during which they continually added to their structure, to heap up a mound measuring 150 feet in circumference, and weighing several tons. The Brush Turkey, though a larger bird, is content with a smaller mound, some thirty to fifty feet in circumference, and four or five feet in height, containing three or four tons of material. In the lower part of this construction, about an arm's length from the surface, the eggs are laid, which are very large for the size of the bird, and they are left to be hatched by the heat engendered in the hot-bed thus provided. Another and all-important provision has not to be neglected. Were the eggs laid in the usual manner, on their sides, unless regularly turned they would inevitably be addled, as the yolk would float up through the white, adhere to the shell, and perish. But, to obviate this danger, the eggs are laid in a vertical position, with their small ends downwards. They are then left entirely to themselves, although it is said that at Woburn the male bird has been seen to visit the mound

¹ Letter to Sir J. Hooker, February 23, 1858.

during the process of incubation, and to thrust in his wattles at different parts, as if taking the temperature.¹

Nor are we yet done with wonders. The chicks are hatched, and come forth to the outer air, practically fledged, with wing-feathers well developed and capable of almost immediate flight, so as to be able at once to shift for themselves.

Here, evidently, we have problems in abundance, which he would be a bold man who should boast to have solved. Can it be supposed that the birds act with a reflective knowledge that the material collected will generate heat sufficient to hatch their eggs and save them from the tedium of incubation? Or is it a more satisfactory hypothesis that some ancestral megapode happening to deposit her eggs on a mass of fermenting vegetation, discovered by chance the trick of artificial heating? How can we account for the vertical position in which the eggs are placed, and the danger thus averted? How come the chicks to be invested with plumage when they come forth? How do they retain life while burrowing through the steaming mass of fermenting material in the midst of which they are born?

Neither can this complication of instincts be accounted for by parental instruction, since the young megapodes obtain no more guidance from their parents than do juvenile caterpillars or salmon smolts. Each generation must make its discoveries for itself; the young are hatched in their mother's absence, and find their sustenance without her help. There is thus apparently nothing which can explain this strange instinct, which, nevertheless, habitually displays itself when occasion offers. Nor, it must be confessed, does it appear to our minds a very satisfactory explanation that all these provisions have been thought out for the birds by an external Power, whose designs they unconsciously accomplish, for undoubtedly it seems to us highly improbable that a Supreme Intelligence should concern itself with details apparently so trivial and unmeaning. It seems the truer philosophy frankly to confess that here, as in so many other instances, nature is for us an inscrutable mystery, which we do but delude ourselves when we endeavour to penetrate.

Another strange nest-builder, whose methods may be studied in our Natural History Museum, is the Hornbill. Birds of this family—inhabiting South Africa—lay their eggs in the hollow of a tree, and in order to avoid the danger caused by

¹ See Sir Herbert Maxwell's *Memories of the Months*, Third Series, pp. 265, seq.

snakes adopt an extraordinary precaution. When the eggs are ready for incubation, the hen bird goes into the hole containing them, and her partner proceeds to immure her there, building over her a covering with a compost of which he has the secret, and which presently hardens like stone, a crevice, or slot, being left in this, through which the imprisoned female can receive food from her mate. When she is thus enclosed, her feathers drop off almost completely, the heat of which would doubtless add greatly to her discomfort in her confined quarters, and, while she broods, a new suit gradually replaces the old one, so that by the time the young are ready to come forth the hen bird is prepared to accompany them. Then, aided by the cock, she breaks down the obstruction which keeps her in, and issues from her voluntary dungeon. It would clearly be quite fatal to this arrangement should the cock bird be killed or disabled while his partner is thus helpless, and it has been observed in various instances that the brooding mother has been attended by two males. Here again, it is certainly not very easy to understand how so extraordinary and unusual a habit has been produced.

It is by no means amongst birds alone that we meet with examples of this kind, there are still stranger instincts exhibited amongst insects, for which it appears still more hopeless to seek an explanation. What, for instance, can be more extraordinary than the history of the fructification of the *Yucca* plant, as affected by means of the *Yucca* moth?¹

The flower of the *Yucca*, which opens only for a single night, depends for fertilization entirely on the services of the moth (*Pronuba*), which issues from its chrysalis just at the same time, while the young of the moth must subsist upon the fertilized ovules of the flower. The stamens of the *Yucca* being too short to reach the summit of the pistil, or stigma, fertilization, necessary alike for plant and insect, can be secured only by the agency of the moth, which, bringing a pellet of pollen from another blossom, plugs with it the orifice of the pistil, and thus secures fertilization. Piercing the ovary beneath with her ovipositor, she lays her eggs amongst the ovules, the fertilization of which is thus provided for, and these, swelling into succulent seeds, afford provender for the young brood, while the *Yucca* depends for propagation on what the grubs

¹ See G. P. Mudge, *Text-book of Zoology*, pp. 349 and 382. Also Sir H. Maxwell, *Memories of the Months*, Third Series, p. 269.

leave untouched. To sum up this strange history, in the words of the author who has been cited:¹

It is proved that unless the stigma be pollinated by the moth, the ovules will not develop; and unless they develop, the larvae of the moth would starve. Now, the insect performs all these acts immediately that it leaves the chrysalis, that is, as soon as it comes into existence; it can therefore have no experience, can have gained no knowledge of what would befall its larvae if not deposited in the exact position, or if so deposited what would be their fate if the ovules did not develop, neither can it have acquired any knowledge as to what is necessary in order that the ovules may develop: and yet unerringly, without guidance of any kind, not even of that which shall tell it which of the multitude of plants around is the *Yucca* plant, it performs the one and only series of acts of its life, in proper sequence, and without loss of time.

In this process, as Sir H. Maxwell observes, there seems to be a distinct act of volition on the part of the insect, quite different from the casual transference of pollen from flower to flower on the hairy bodies of bees or flies. "But science is dumb if you ask her how *Pronuba* learned her part; she can only report the performance."

These instances, no doubt, are exceptionally calculated to attract attention, and illustrate the point with which we commenced, but they are by no means altogether singular, nor is it necessary to betake ourselves to other climes and seek amongst exotic creatures cases of import fundamentally similar. Among the lower forms of life in particular, notably amongst insects, arachnids, and the like, there is a vast field for the observer to explore, in which, if instead of blindly accepting all that he reads in books, he will but think for himself, he will often have to confess that for all our science we are as much in the dark as ever concerning the true history of life. Who that has watched a common caterpillar spinning the web for its cocoon, or a spider for its larder, can imagine how its marvellous skill was acquired, and transmitted. Or, to go higher in the scale of life, how does the bottle-tit contrive to rear its multitude of young in its poke-pudding of a nest, without being smothered, and to bring them out spick-and-span without having their plumage hopelessly ruffled? How is the sanitation of such a domicile provided for? How does that most dressy of birds, the hoopoe, succeed in producing its young ones in smart and

¹ Mudge, *ut sup.*

elegant guise from the loathsome filth which almost always defiles its nest, in the interior of a tree? So with innumerable examples, from which these are taken almost at random. To reply, as is so often done, that all is the result of "heredity," obviously tells us nothing, for this means no more than that in each generation the puzzle is repeated, which gives no information that can do aught but enhance the wonder. Would it not be far wiser, as already suggested, to forego the hopeless attempt to account for what is so obviously beyond us, and instead of seeking to explain the inexplicable, to acknowledge with the great observer, J. H. Fabre, that "in truth we know nothing about anything, so far as ultimate truths are concerned. Scientifically considered nature is a riddle to which human curiosity can find no answer."

J. G.

The Catholic Women's League.

THE Catholic Church which exalts a woman to the highest place in creation has never failed to keep before the world an ideal of perfect womanhood for which we may look elsewhere in vain. And the result has been twofold. On the one hand the Church has given to countless women a lofty conception of life, an inspiring mission, an abiding source of encouragement: and, on the other, the Church has received from countless women in all ages services which they alone could render—services which have given a distinct colour and character to Catholicism.

Hence, when Mr. Gladstone a generation ago depreciated the conquests of the Catholic Church in England on the ground that they were "chiefly among women," he appears to have forgotten the important share which women have had in the diffusion of Christian ideals. In the great ages of the Church, women exerted their influence not merely by carrying on the priceless tradition of Catholic domestic life, but by contributing in a signal degree to the social life of the community. An article in the *Catholic World* for June, 1875, gives a remarkable conspectus of the part played by Catholic women in the development of Catholic art, science, literature, and philosophy. As regards the general subject of education for women the writer remarks that "the increasing demand which we have on every side for a more substantial and scholarly training of the sex does not look forward to that which they never had, but backward to that which they have lost or abandoned."

Catholics, then, will welcome as a return to a more satisfactory state of affairs the growing movement which would give to women "the substantial and scholarly training" of former days. And although the movement as we see it in the world about us suffers, as all such movements have suffered, from the strident demands and exaggerated claims of extremists, yet it should not be impossible to discern the false from the true, and

to detect what is of real value in the theories and proposals which have been put forward.

It is, in fact, very important that in the midst of the general movement for improved opportunities for women the Catholic voice should make itself heard. For the Church does lay down certain guiding principles in the matter which are of inestimable value, and it is most desirable that they should exert their influence on the movement. But the principles *are* general and need to be brought down to particular applications suited to time and place. This can only be done in one way: namely, by the organization of Catholic women themselves. If they are to exhibit the Catholic ideal to the world they must develop by means of wise organization a "Catholic social sense."

For some years past various movements in this direction have been in progress on the continent and have received the warm approbation of the hierarchy. The German *Frauenbund* in particular has done admirable work. But it is our purpose in this article to give some brief account of a movement in this country which, while assimilating much of what has proved valuable in continental institutions, is at the same time so healthily indigenous and so well suited to actual conditions that its very considerable success has surprised no one who has taken the trouble to watch its development.

The Catholic Women's League is not yet three years old. It began with a paper read by Miss Margaret Fletcher at a meeting of the Catholic Ladies' Conference in July, 1906, on the work of the German *Frauenbund* and kindred associations on the continent. The audience numbered only fourteen ladies, but their encouragement and desire to start a similar work in England led to further developments. Miss Fletcher's paper was published in the *Crucible*, and circulated as a pamphlet. All who were willing to help in starting a women's league were invited to communicate with Mrs. Neville who had kindly undertaken to act as temporary Hon. Secretary. Some eighty ladies responded. Various negotiations with societies and individuals followed, in which Miss Fletcher and Miss Wyatt Papworth took the leading part. The Archbishop of Westminster approved of the scheme, and a provisional Executive Committee held its first meeting in February, 1907. The Archbishop appointed Miss Fletcher, President, Miss Wyatt Papworth, Hon. Treasurer, and Miss Ada Streeter, to whose gift for organization the League owes so much, Hon. Secretary.

Let us begin by glancing at the material growth of the League since this first meeting of the Executive Committee.

The eighty members have grown to more than a thousand. To these we must add the Branch members, over four hundred in Manchester (founded January, 1908), a hundred and fifty at Bournemouth and Boscombe (March and April, 1908), and sixty-two at Brighton (December, 1908). The official headquarters have expanded proportionately. They consisted first of all of the Hon. Secretary's private residence. Then a small room was taken over the Art and Book Company, at 28, Ashley Place, Westminster. To this a second and much larger room has lately been added. Here are held debates and smaller League meetings, and here, too, the sectional secretaries have their office.

For the work of the League has grown far beyond the control of a single secretary. An assistant Hon. Secretary was first added for general work. Then came secretaries for the various spheres of activity taken up by the League, the Information Office, the Lectures Committee, the Debates Committee, the Educational Lectures Committee, the Scholarship Sub-Committee, and the Arts and Crafts Committee. Each committee is responsible to the Central Executive Committee. A Council which includes representatives of local executives meets once a year or oftener, and is the final court of appeal in all matters concerning the discipline and policy of the League. An annual general meeting of the members of the League receives the report and balance sheet, and elects the officers and the Central Executive Committee.

What has the League done during the short period of its existence? We may fairly answer that it has done wonders. We can only here review some part of its manifold and well-co-ordinated operations.

Let us take first some examples of what may be called pioneer work, at least so far as Catholics are concerned.

One achievement of the League has been the foundation of two scholarships (one for two years, the other for three) at the London School of Economics. Of the importance of this step something will be said presently. Again the League has been the foster-parent of the Nursery College founded at Hampstead by Mrs. Bernard Mole. This institution opens up so many possibilities that it deserves an article to itself. Suffice to say here that the new organization, which is making

most satisfactory progress, would alone have justified the existence of the League. Once more, the League has been authorized by the Belgian Government to form the nucleus of an undenominational committee for the Home Education Congress to be held in connection with the Brussels Exhibition in 1910. In these and other ways the League has been able to undertake important work which no amount of individual initiative among the Catholic women of England was likely to have effected. And by carrying out such work the League has demonstrated the extraordinary amount of material which we already possess, and which only needed organization in order to take its place in enterprises of national importance.

No less satisfying has been the progress of the League in raising the general level of efficiency among its members. Its record of debates, lectures and other "educative" machinery is extremely creditable.

Let us first take the subject of lectures. The range of topics has been very wide, extending from scholastic philosophy (Father Sharpe and Dr. Aveling), and evolution (Father Elrington), to domestic drudgery. Here are some of the titles: Catholic Children under the Poor Law, Administrative work for Women, The Business Habit in Daily Life, The Importance of Economic Study for Catholic Women, Apprenticeship, Emigration, The Supernatural in History, The Nature of Historical Evidence, Citizenship, The Symbolism of Dante.

Among the lecturers we find the names of Mrs. Wilfrid Ward, Mrs. John Boland, Mrs. Katharine Tynan Hinkson, Dr. Alice Vowe Johnson, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. James Britten, Mr. James Hope, M.P., Mr. Hilaire Belloc, M.P., the Hon. Charles Russell, and Father Maturin.

The Debating Society has provided a large number of both formal and "scratch" debates, and has moreover given rise to a Literary Circle for the discussion of books and literary subjects.

Various other special works have been undertaken by the League, including the decoration of the halls used during the Eucharistic Congress, and the presentation of one hundred and twenty missals as a Jubilee gift to the Holy Father. We need not point out the advantage of having an organized body of ladies who, on special occasions such as these, may call upon and co-ordinate the generous services of individuals.

Passing now to a very different field of activity, we note the increasing usefulness of the Information Office, an institution

of which Catholic Women have long felt the want. There has been a steady growth in the number of applications received, and in the extent to which satisfying answers have been given. The office was started some eighteen months ago, and is intended to serve as a channel of communication extending over the whole country between Catholic work and Catholic workers—whether voluntary or salaried—and to serve as a source of information on all subjects of Catholic social enterprise and activity, or affecting Catholic interests.

Already some eight hundred applications have been received, for paid work and for salaried workers—for voluntary work and voluntary workers, and finally for information on the subjects above indicated.

About fifty applicants for paid work have been directly placed in suitable and lucrative positions. Many others have been referred to various agencies and offices through which they have subsequently obtained employment. Twenty-five salaried posts at the disposal of the office have been filled: seventy-five referred to other agencies. Fifty-eight out of seventy-nine applications for voluntary workers in Catholic charitable work have been satisfactorily met. It would be interesting if space allowed to give a further analysis of the above list, and to observe the great advantage which has already accrued to the Catholic body from the work of the office, as, for example, in the presence on non-Catholic committees of an increased number of Catholic representatives.

Of the 150 general applications 124 have been successfully answered, these successes including the obtaining of a free hospital training, the admission of a colonial trained nurse to a missionary nursing Order, a highly qualified Catholic governor for a secondary school, and so forth. The applications have been very various, ranging from requests for addresses of lodgings and hotels, schools, institutions, &c., to literary references, professional introductions, and investigation work.

The above may suffice to give us a general idea of the work undertaken by the League, and to enable us to answer the important question as to the spirit and methods of the new association.

In the first place it cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the League is non-political. Too many of us seem to be under the impression that a society which does not restrict its activities to domestic or charitable matters must be a society

run in the interest of a political party. We have yet to learn what a glance at Catholic organization in Germany, for instance, would teach us, namely that there is an immense field of Catholic social work which goes far beyond the domestic and charitable sphere, and is yet quite independent of party politics. True, where this field is occupied by a well-organized army of workers, domestic life and political life gain very considerably. Incidentally the workers learn much that is of value in home duties and help to provide (as the information-office has already done) many Catholics with a livelihood corresponding to their capacities. And, on the other hand, these same workers learn to use whatever political power they possess more wisely in the interest of the Church than they otherwise might; for they acquire a grasp of Catholic principles and some insight into modern needs.

Yet the field of Catholic social work, and in particular the Catholic Women's League, is entirely independent of party politics. The League does not consist of suffragettes in disguise. Neither, on the other hand, does it consist of anti-suffragettes in disguise. It has no official voice whatever in the matter. Every variety of political opinion is, we doubt not, represented by the members. But in all matters pertaining to the work of the League they keep their political convictions resolutely locked up in their own breasts. To produce them would create instant schism. The loyalty of the members in this respect has been above suspicion and is a secure tradition. The official voice of the League speaks of things Catholic and of them alone. And the official action of the League would be taken only at the request of authority and upon a question on which Catholics were united in defence of their interests.

Once again, the League, although distinctly a social institution in one sense of the term, is by no means a "social" institution in another. It is social in what we may call the continental use of the word,—a use which is not yet sufficiently familiar amongst us to obviate misunderstandings. It is not "social" in what we may call the caste sense. It does not aim at the abolition of social distinctions. It does not seek to increase anyone's "visiting list" or to give Mrs. Brown the cherished desire of her life,—the *entrée* to Lady Jones' drawing-room. Had this been its aim we venture to affirm that it could not have lived a month! What it does seek to do is to promote "fellowship" on the basis of common Catholicism and common

womanhood. It respects all differences of class, tradition, circumstances, and education, and looks upon these differences as so many different gifts,—different aspects of life, different opportunities of usefulness, different experiences of human nature—which each brings to be pooled for the common good: the common good being realized by individual help from each to all, and collective help towards furthering the cause of the Church in England.

To get a general view of the aims and methods of the League we must not confine our attention to any one branch of its work. The very success which has attended the labours of the departmental sections might mislead those who have been brought into contact with any one of them. The League is not a debating society, nor a registry office, nor a lecture club. It supports all these things and many others: but it does not exist for any one of them. Its real *raison d'être* is to promote solidarity among Catholic women and to band them into a League with a large and close-knit organization which will be ready to respond whenever the needs of the Church require collective and organized service on a large scale.

The ideals of the League, then, may be summed up as follows:

More efficient work for the Catholic cause among lay-women.—Their more direct moral and intellectual influence in combating the anti-religious propaganda of the day.—The growth of experience and knowledge by co-operation.—The prevention of that waste of time, money, and energy, which results from overlapping and isolation.—The increase in the number of social workers.—The providing of practical training in social work.—Solidarity and a habit of concerted action among Catholic women.

The League does not seek to found new charities and enterprises, but to supply the machinery for intercommunication and co-operation by which all existing Catholic work must ultimately benefit.

Rapid as the increase of membership of the League has been, it is clear that there are wide fields which yet remain to be conquered. Whole districts of the country and many large towns are as yet unrepresented. Now the League has given abundant proof of its devoted Catholic spirit, its power of healthy adaptation to circumstances, and its admirable enthusiasm and instinct for discipline. It has received warm ecclesiastical approbation, and has justified the selection of

its motto: *Charity, Work, Loyalty*. Hence there would seem to be little fear of its growth outstripping its efficiency or its prudence. It has a vigorous Catholic personality which may reassure even the most timorous. We have, therefore, no hesitation in urging our readers to work strenuously for the increase of its membership and for the multiplication of local branches. We can scarcely exaggerate the importance of the work which lies before the League, and which only a largely increased membership will enable it to perform.

Yet important as numbers are, it is, of course, very necessary that the new recruits should make some effort to realize the spirit of the League, and to render it the service which it asks of them. The League is not an entertainment society. It does not profess to compete with parochial "socials" and local whist-drives. Even to say that it "combines instruction with amusement" is to give but a distorted notion of its purpose. It does not cater for the restless girl who wants a new "cause," any more than it caters for the bored lady who seeks a fresh sensation. It calls for hard and sometimes humdrum work. But, in return it offers what we may call a Catholic background to life; and this is a very desirable exchange for boredom or restlessness,—or both, since the two frequently go together.

Indeed, the Catholic Women's League is not likely to make anyone "flighty." On the contrary it is likely to foster a steady devotion to duty, and an enlightened interest in household tasks. But it will develop to a remarkable degree an instinct of comradeship, a readiness to give others a helping hand, and a devotion to Catholic ideals and practices.

A reason which, perhaps, might deter some from joining the League is their feeling that they have nothing to contribute to the movement: their lives are filled up with household or business tasks, and they are not in a position of life which gives any obvious opportunity for social service.

Now it is very probable that these people are not alive to the possibilities of valuable help which they might render to the common service without any interference in their duties of life. The amount of work to be done is so vast and so varied that every woman can find opportunities of furthering the interests of the League in one way or another. Each one has at least some little experience or special knowledge which may be of help to others. This point might be illustrated at length did space permit. We can only advise our readers to communicate

with the Hon. Secretary of the League, 28, Ashley Place, Westminster, and become members. They will then find abundance of opportunity for bringing their activities into profitable relation with those of their fellow-Catholics. The League is of particular utility to converts who are desirous of making themselves useful but have not as yet found a congenial field of work.

Membership of the League is open to any Catholic woman, who must be either proposed and seconded by members of the League or recommended by a priest and duly elected by the Executive committee. The minimum annual subscription for members is one shilling. The organ of the League is *The Crucible*, an admirable quarterly magazine of higher education for women, which has been more than once commended in these columns.

Much might be said as to the value of the specific forms of activity undertaken by the League. True, the value of lectures and debates may be exaggerated; but we do not think that this is a danger to which we Catholics are as yet particularly liable. The work undertaken by the League in this direction has been demonstrably beneficial. We may be allowed to quote some words spoken at the Second Annual General Meeting of the League.

Mrs. Philip Gibbs, speaking on behalf of the Lectures Committee, said:

I have given no idea, and it would not be easy for me to do so, even in many words, of the extraordinary quickening of the intellectual life among many Catholic women which has resulted from these lectures. It has been a great thing to many of our members to join a society of their own sisters and Faith, and to meet in a rendezvous where they would hear something more stimulating than social tittle-tattle.

Similarly, Mrs. Wilfrid Ward, speaking of the Debating Society, said:

Far from tending to encourage a superficial way of thinking or a habit of rash assertion, these debates made it necessary to think as seriously as possible, as well as to express those thoughts with clearness. . . . There was also the charm of exchanging thoughts with active minds, the satisfaction of sympathy with those who hold the same opinions, and all the incitement of friendly opposition.

Of the immense utility of the Information Office nothing further need be said. But we may be allowed to point to the

growing realization among the members of the League of the need for the scientific study by Catholics of social questions. The foundation of two scholarships at the London School of Economics is a most significant step in advance. We trust that Catholic laymen will, before long, follow this example.

We believe that some of the most valuable work which the Catholic Women's League is likely to accomplish on behalf of the Catholic body will lie in this direction. No doubt it will take some time before the value of such work is as completely grasped by the main body of the League as it should be. The idea is necessarily a new one to most of us, and can only be gradually absorbed into our circle of ideas. It is a satisfaction to know that those who have hitherto guided the fortunes of the League with such admirable skill and judgment are fully alive to our requirements in this respect. We may conclude with some words spoken by the President at the last General Meeting.

I think the most serious side of the social work of the League can hardly be said to have thoroughly begun until those who are attracted to social study have banded themselves together into a study circle. Numerically small as we are, and surrounded by the highly-developed social work of other bodies, we yet have a strength out of all proportion to our size, the strength of our intellectual position. But what is the use of being heirs to a strong intellectual position if we don't know what it is and can't state it. How many of us in this room this afternoon have an accurate knowledge of the economic and civic histories of our own and other countries, and, still more important, of the Church's action and teaching in regard to these histories and to the questions of the hour.

The Catholic Truth Society is at work laying the foundations of a literature which will have to be built up in this country on the subject. We are ambitious enough to hope that our economic scholars may contribute to this, but cannot we of the rank and file supply a band of readers and of students who will try to spread sound teaching among the less educated? The Rationalistic Press is master of the art of appealing to ignorance, and, as has been truly said, when you appeal to ignorance you appeal to one of the greatest powers in the world. And the only way to weaken the power is to lessen the ignorance. To this end a band formed from our membership might work.

We sincerely trust that this suggestion on the part of the President may be carried into effect. We hope, too, that in course of time something may be done to co-ordinate the efforts of Catholic priests and laymen who are similarly interested in social study. But with regard to this matter we hope to offer some suggestions on a future occasion.

P.

St. Anselm of Canterbury.

IN an age when men's minds are set upon keeping centenaries it is not difficult to find great characters of the past who can be becomingly honoured in this way. One such, one peculiarly such, is St. Anselm of Canterbury, the eighth centenary of whose death occurred on the 21st of last month, and was appropriately honoured not only by a commemoration service in Westminster Cathedral, but also in many Anglican churches. That Anglicans should wish thus to honour a great prelate of the medieval church, and in so doing to claim him as their own, seems to have irritated some of our Catholic journalists. But surely it should please us that this section of our fellow-countrymen should wish to commemorate a Catholic saint like Anselm rather than repulsive characters like Luther or John Knox. Their preference for the former marks the extent to which they have come to share our ideals of Catholic truth, and, although it may be necessary for us at times to contend with them about the points on which we differ, that is no reason why we should not be glad that occasions arise when we can rejoice over our points of agreement.

St. Anselm has been called the greatest of all the Archbishops of Canterbury, and the estimate seems just, though to say so is to say a great deal when we reflect how splendid was the long list of those who occupied the primatial See from the days of Augustine to the days of Pole. And yet he was not of English, or even of Norman origin, but was a native of the Piedmontese town of Aosta. Perhaps that is a matter not unworthy of our attention, as we look back to gather the lessons of his career. The sense of nationality is so strong with us now-a-days that we forget how often what we practically mean by it is insularity; and forget, too, that there is an ideal which from a religious point of view is grander than nationality, the ideal which fired the enthusiasm of St. Paul when he thought how in the nascent Church the racial distinctions of Jew and

Gentile had ceased to have place, the ideal which we now express by the glorious name of Catholic. True, there is an aspect under which for ordinary purposes it is desirable that spiritual rulers should be of the same race with their flocks, but it is not to be pressed unduly. Have we not an evidence of this in the many ecclesiastics of foreign origin who have wrought so well, and endeared themselves so much to their flocks in our modern English Church? And is not the same lesson taught us by great prelates like Theodore of Tarsus, Lanfranc of Pavia, Anselm of Aosta, Boniface of Savoy, Hugh of Avalon, and others who in their time were adored by the nation and shed lustre on the English Church?

At Aosta then Anselm was born, and it was at Aosta that his youth was spent. His parents were both of noble birth and well endowed with this world's goods. But his father, though towards the close of his days he entered a monastery and led a life of penitence, had been till then a thoroughly worldly man, and it was to his good mother and the monks of the neighbouring monastery where he got his schooling that the boy's natural disposition towards piety was fostered and developed. At the age of fifteen he conceived the idea of becoming a monk himself, and was only deterred because the Abbot, in fear of the father's wrath, refused to receive him. Owing to this refusal, and to his mother's death not long after, he lapsed into a phase of comparative worldliness. "The ship of my soul," he says in the reminiscences of his later life, "lost its anchor and wandered altogether into the ways of the world." It was a phase the recollection of which always stirred him to feelings of the deepest penitence, but saints in their self-accusations are given to exaggerate, and at all events the phase did not last long. When he was about twenty-three, his father having conceived a dislike for him, he determined to lead a studious life and with this intention spent three years in different houses of study in Burgundy and France. It was thus that, influenced probably by the fame of Lanfranc, now the first teacher of the age, he found his way to the Norman Abbey of Bec, where Lanfranc was giving his lectures and attracting disciples from all parts to hear him. The teacher took at once to his new pupil and quickly discerned the high promise, spiritual and intellectual, that was in him. They were kindred spirits, and became to each other as father and son, united together in a close friendship destined to be lifelong.

For a while Anselm's position in the monastery was that of an extern student, but by the time he was twenty-seven he felt that he must decide definitely on the question of vocation. His father was now dead, and the family fortune had passed into his hands. Should he return to Aosta and live a good and beneficent Christian life among his own people, or should he become a monk? He felt that it was to the monastic life that God called him. But where, at Cluny or at Bec? The life at Cluny he feared might be too severe for his weak health. At Bec would not the fruit of all his hard studies be wasted, overshadowed as he would be and rendered superfluous by the transcendent learning of Lanfranc? We need not blame him for thus regarding the reasons for and against. It was not unsuitable that he should wish to go where what appeared to him to be his very modest talent might be of some solid use. Still, the effect of this presentation of his case was to cast him into a deep sense of self-abasement. How could he have forgotten that "a man does not become a monk to be set over others and be magnified before them, but to be placed below all for God's sake, and to be esteemed the least and most abject of all"? Thus enlightened, and having taken counsel with Lanfranc and, at his suggestion, of the Archbishop of Rouen, he offered himself to the abbey he had learnt to love, and was accepted—saying to himself, as is recorded, "Here let my rest be, with God alone for the object of my endeavours, His love for my contemplation, the blessed and diligent remembrance of Him for my sweet and all-satisfying consolation." And here his rest was for the thirty-three years that followed, the first three of which he spent as a simple monk, the next fifteen as Prior in succession to Lanfranc, then made Abbot of Caen, and the last fifteen as Abbot in succession to Herluin, the founder of the monastery, who expired at an advanced age in 1078. These were the formative years of his life, during which he developed into a perfect Religious, an experienced guide of souls, an able administrator, and a profound theologian; acquired, in short, those choice endowments of soul and mind which enabled him to exercise such an influence for good not only on his own age but on the ages to follow. It is our happy fortune to have in the case of Anselm what in so many other cases we lack, a wealth of detailed records on which we can fully rely. His friend Eadmer, who became his chaplain when he took up the Archbishopric, and remained his inseparable

companion in England and through all the time of his wanderings on the continent, and who did not fail to use his excellent opportunities of gathering information from the eye-witnesses of his whole previous life, has written both a *Life of Anselm* and a *Historia Novorum*, of which the former gives the particulars of his private life and reveals to us his inner spirit, whilst the latter records more at length the incidents of his public action. Then there are the many letters of the Saint dating from the time of his Priorate of Bec and continuing till his last days, letters written most of them to fellow-monks, but many, especially in his later days, to others who sought his advice on spiritual matters or public affairs. Also there are his spiritual writings, his Homilies and Exhortations, his Book of Prayers and Meditations, and his Hymns and Rhythms; not to speak of his doctrinal writings to which in view of their theological importance we must refer presently. It is from the outpourings of a man's own soul that we can best attain to an exact estimate of his personality, and Anselm's writings are singularly helpful in this respect. To those who will study them diligently they will bring him home almost as if he were a familiar companion. But we must be content here to borrow from his friend Eadmer a brief outline of some leading features in his manner of life.

It is a pleasing picture which Eadmer draws of his friend and father in those quiet monastic days at Bec. Anselm began his religious life by taking the most fervent and exact of his fellow-monks to be his patterns, but soon, in the general judgment, he surpassed them all, and became himself such an entrancing pattern of monastic virtue, that no monk in the whole community could wish for one more worthy of imitation. His humility was as profound as it was simple and unaffected, and it was his solicitude to be most observant of every rule and counsel of his Superiors. He grasped thoroughly the necessity of mortification for one who desired to obtain the grace of self-mastery, and to keep the wings of the soul free for ascent into the higher regions of Divine communion. Hence, he was most severe with himself in his penitential practices, and, as regards food for which he appeared to have lost all relish, was induced only by his strong common-sense to take what was absolutely requisite to sustain life. In prayer, contemplation, and the study of Holy Scripture was his chief delight, and his devotion

was so ready and constant, that according to his biographer, he could not think of the blessedness of the life to come without shedding floods of tears. This is a fact to be borne in mind if we would breathe back into the now dead words of his writings the living spirit which animated them in their first utterance. Read, for instance, such characteristic words as these which occur in his Fifteenth Meditation, on the past benefits of Christ.

Leave not the company of Mary Magdalene, but be mindful to go with her to the tomb of the Lord with her preparation of spices. As she with her eyes, so do you in spirit . . . merit to see Christ Himself gladdening her sorrows and tears with His tender look, and with His sweet voice saying to her "Mary." At the sound of this voice the cataracts burst forth from her head, tears flow forth from her inmost being, sighs and sobs are drawn forth from the very depths of her soul. "Mary!" O Blessed one, what must have been your thoughts, what your feelings, when at the sound of this voice thou didst cast thyself at His feet, and didst return His salutation, crying out "Rabboni." O with what affection, with what desire, with what burning ardour of mind didst thou cry out "Rabboni"!

Now I can say no more. My tears forbid it, the heart's affection obstructs the voice, an excess of love absorbs every sense of soul and body! But why, O sweet Jesus, why dost Thou repel from Thy sacred and most precious Feet one who loves Thee so greatly? Thou dost say: "Touch Me not." But why, O Lord? Why may I not touch, why may I not touch and kiss those Feet so precious which for me were pierced and bathed in blood? Hast Thou become hostile to me in proportion as Thou hast become glorious? Nay, I will not release Thee, I will not depart from Thee, I will not spare my tears, my heart shall break with sobs and sighs, unless I touch Thee.

If this was the habitual tone of Anselm's intercourse with God, we cannot be surprised to read how he was wont to prolong his vigils far into the night hours, and indeed it was only then that he could find time to satisfy his heart's cravings, for from the time when he was made Prior he had on his hands the souls of others besides his own to tend. The community though so young was a large one, and numbered some hundred and fifty. Their Rule bade the brethren have recourse to their Superior for spiritual direction and it was a rule which their confidence in his wisdom made them the more desirous to keep, for they believed that "the very spirit of counsel reigned in his heart" and attributed it to his familiarity with divine things, and his deep ponderings on the sacred text. He seemed

to know by instinct what was in the hearts of each, and the laws according to which the seeds of virtues and vices take root, spring up, and intertwine in the hearts of young and old. So they flocked to his cell and kept him occupied with their necessities all through the day and often into the night as well. And not his fellow-monks only, but in increasing numbers, as his fame spread, persons from outside of all classes and from all parts.

This influence for good which he possessed is further traceable to two qualities which were particularly noticeable in him. First he was of a singularly lovable disposition. He was full of sympathy, and few who came near him could resist the charm of his manner. A signal instance of this was his influence over a ruler so stern and hard to move as William the Conqueror. When he came to this despot's court, says Eadmer, "the King would lay aside the stern mien which made him appear so fierce and terrible to the many, and in Anselm's presence, to the amazement of all, would become so kindly and affable as to seem quite another man." Again on another striking occasion when an exile from England he was journeying through Burgundy to Rome, no less a person than the Duke of Burgundy himself thought to fall on the archiepiscopal party and rob it of its goods. The Duke demanded loudly which was the Archbishop, but having for a moment looked at him with a grim countenance he was seized with a sudden shame, cast down his eyes, and knew not what to say. Then on his offering him the kiss of peace he exclaimed cordially, "Lord Archbishop, I am prepared to kiss you and to serve you, and rejoicingly I thank the Lord for your coming." Secondly he added to soundness of judgment an independence of mind which enabled him to surmount unreasonable prejudices. Eadmer records a dialogue with an Abbot who came to visit him which illustrates this feature in his method. The Abbot complained of his ill success in the management of the boys under his charge, notwithstanding the severe discipline to which he subjected them. Anselm instructed him, just as a modern educationalist might do, in the true science of training the young. Do not circumvent them with prohibitions, he said. Shut up a young tree within walls on all sides, and it will fail to grow, or if it grows its branches will cross and impede one another. So will it be with the child if you leave it no room for the expansion of its being. Show them paternal fondness

and support. Be mild with them, bear with them, encourage them. Do not be so anxious in the first stage to make them hardy and stable of purpose. Let that come later. It is milk which is good for infants. It is when they are older we begin to feed them on bread. But that Anselm, unlike so many modern educationalists, could be severe on fitting occasions, the beautiful story of his treatment of the young monk Osbern proves. We must not stay to dwell on this point, save just to note how, though he was fond of children and children of him, it was the youths he best loved to train. Mature age, he used to say, is too hard to take new impressions, childhood is too soft to retain them. In adolescence you find the due mean which can both receive and retain. Perhaps, though we see it in his conduct rather than hear it expounded by him in set terms, we may include also in that method of dealing with others which was the fruit of his shrewd insight and independence of judgment as well as of his sympathetic nature, another point which lifted him above the horizon of his age and accounted for his triumphs in difficult emergencies. In his age, and long after, few realized how the advocacy of a good cause can be compromised by violence of language. Anselm never made this mistake. With whomsoever he had to contend we never find him losing his balance; though he was always firm in his resolve to adhere to the right, his speech was invariably so grave and mild that it often placated but never exasperated the offender.

If we are to form a complete estimate of his personality as it was formed in the quietude of his Abbey of Bec, we must think of him not merely as a saintly Religious, but also as a theologian of singular originality and insight. We have from his pen several theological treatises—the *Monologion*, on the nature of God, the *Proslogion* on what is called the ontological argument for the existence of God, the *Liber de Fide Trinitatis et de Incarnatione Verbi*, the *De Processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos*, the *Dialogus de casu Diaboli*, the *Cur Deus Homo* on the motive of the Incarnation in the necessity of redemption, the *De Conceptu Virginis* on original sin, *De Concordia Gratiae et liberi Arbitrii*, and others. Of these the two first were composed whilst he was at Bec, the *De Incarnatione Verbi* whilst still at Canterbury, and in the thick of his anxious controversies with the Red King, the *Cur Deus Homo* then and during a season of enforced leisure at Schiavi, in Southern

Italy. The *De Processione Spiritus Sancti* was the matured form of an address he had been unexpectedly called upon to give at the Council of Bari in 1098; the *De Concordia* was written at Canterbury towards the close of his life, when his troubles were at last over. This means that throughout his life he was engaged in writing theological treatises, and one cannot read without feeling that in each of these treatises he was addressing himself to some question by which the acute minds of his contemporaries were exercised. He wrote to relieve their anxious inquiries, and in this sense was, as William of Malmesbury calls him, *anxie doctus*. In other words, it is erroneous to judge, as some of his more recent biographers have done, that in these speculations Anselm was in advance of his age, and could only hope to be understood by far distant generations. Their error is due to the recognition that he discusses the very questions which exercise men's minds in the present day, combined with the assumption that the minds of his contemporaries were too undeveloped to be concerned about them. But the fact is these questions are as old as the hills, and were as burning in those ancient monastic schoolrooms as in our modern universities. St. Anselm was far from being out of touch with his age, yet it is true that he was the originator of a new method. He was the first of the Scholastics, and laid the foundations of that solid edifice of doctrine which his successors raised to such splendid heights and proportions. The root idea of this method is that expressed by the maxim *fides quaerens intellectum*, faith seeking to understand, and by understanding to fuse into a complete rational system the principles which it has first embraced on the authority of revelation. Let us hear him, for it affords a good specimen of his style, expound in his own words the force and significance of this maxim.

No Christian ought to dispute whether what the Catholic Church believes with the heart and confesses with the mouth is true or not; but, whilst always holding that faith without doubting, loving it, and living according to its rule, let him seek in all the humility of which he is capable the reason why it is so. If he finds he can understand, God be thanked; if he cannot, let him not bend down his horns to destroy but his head to venerate, for it is easier for human wisdom too trustful of itself to tear out its horns by digging them into the rock, than by applying all its strength to tear up the rock itself. . . . For it is manifest that those have not firmness of faith who, because they cannot

understand what they believe, dispute against the truth of the faith confirmed as it is by the Holy Fathers of the Church. What else are they save bats and owls, who because they see the heavens only in the night-time dispute as to the brightness of the mid-day sun with the eagles who look upon the sun itself with unflinching gaze.¹

Before we follow Anselm from Bec to Canterbury, let us pause to gather a lesson which is often overlooked by students of medieval history. The Middle Ages are a puzzle to them. They see how wild passions ruled the day in the King's Court and the Baron's castle, how immorality of the gravest kind was rampant, how uncurbed brutality ground down the weak, deprived them of the means of subsistence, enslaved them to the vices of their oppressors. Nor can they distinguish between the layman and the churchman. The latter might be clad in different robes, and preside over a different class of ceremonial functions, but their manners and their morals appear much the same. Prelates obtain their sees and their abbeys through royal favouritism, or by abominable simony; and, having obtained them by this means, they acknowledge but one obedience, or rather subservience, namely, to do the pleasure of their feudal lords, whilst in other respects they lead lives as free from the restraints of ecclesiastical law and duty as any secular prince and noble by their side. And as with the prelates so with the clergy of the second order, secular and regular. It was in the nature of things that these should take their tone from their official superiors, and so they did, neglecting their pastoral duties, and spending their lives in indolence, worldliness, or even concubinage. Is it possible not to feel that in a period when this was the all-pervading note, religion in any true sense had died out, or survived only in a splendid formalism and a superstitious trust in the efficacy of external rites disconnected with interior morality? So argue a multitude of those on whose histories our modern readers are brought up, though not so much now as a generation or two ago. But it is because they lack the true historic sense, and take note only of what lies on the surface, neglecting the mighty religious forces which if not so obtrusive were steadily working throughout the length and breadth of that vast social structure.

The inner life of such an abbey as Bec, revealed to us as it is in Eadmer's writings and Anselm's correspondence, is most precious in this respect that it affords an insight into the nature

¹ *De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.

of those religious forces, and enables us to measure the range and intensity of their influence. Anselm himself is a supreme instance of the sort of men these monasteries of strict observance could turn out. His much-loved father and predecessor, Lanfranc, is another. Bishop Gundulphus is another. As we pass Rochester in the train and cast our eyes on the grim Norman keep which bears his name and frowns down on the Medway, we might be prone to think of him too as one of those wild prelates to whom the sword was more familiar than the crozier. But Anselm's correspondence will reveal to us how like himself was this *anima dilectissima animae meae*, this soul so dear to his soul, this cherished companion of his early life in the monastery whose name was next to his own on the boards, who "set his heart and its affections so ardently upon the love of our heavenly country," this tried friend "the thought of whom could never fade from Anselm's memory" because he "was graven on his heart as the seal is on the wax." And then there were Henry, the Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, and Gislebert, Abbot of Westminster, these and others whom Anselm had known and loved at Bec, who shared his spirit and its aims, and had gone forth to communicate that spirit to other groups of men. Or, if we go outside Bec, there were Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, and Hugh, Abbot of Cluny; and there was Pope Urban II. himself (like St. Gregory VII., his great predecessor, a son of Cluny), who had such an esteem for Anselm that he counted it more becoming that he should seek advice from our saint than impart it to him. These were the kind of men who were working for God in the midst of that wicked world, and leavening it with their spirit — these and many who resembled them in character and aims, and exercised a similarly salutary influence within their more limited spheres.

Moreover, to say that their teaching and example spread as a Christian leaven through the world is to disallow what one frequently hears said, namely, that the monasteries, though now superfluous, were in those days a necessity, because then it was barely possible to lead a good Christian life outside those sanctuaries of peace. Nor can it be doubted that Catholic faith as it abounded anywhere, so it everywhere bore fruit in good Christian lives, in the world, that is to say, as well as the cloister — though caused in high degree and sustained, then as now, by the influence of the cloister. In two ways particularly this causality

acted. One is apt in the history of those times to overlook the influence of the devout wives and mothers. They too had been mostly trained in the convents, and in their turn they laid the foundations of faith and piety in the hearts of their children, co-operating in this respect with the monasteries for their sons and the convents for their daughters. It was thus with Anselm himself, who received his earliest religious training and bent from his mother and from the monks of a neighbouring abbey. Matilda, wife of the Conqueror, was likewise a good pious woman, as were her daughter Adela, Countess of Blois, and Matilda, the niece of Edgar the Atheling and Queen of Henry I., two women who always sought and valued Anselm's advice. What we desire to emphasize is that through the united efforts of these good women and the cloistered Religious so many of the men of those days began their lives well, and that, if when they grew up they too often succumbed to the temptations of that wild undisciplined age, the sentiments of their pious childhood did not altogether die out of their recollections, and so must be taken into account in estimating the influence of the faith upon their lives. Thus Rufus himself, who disputes with John the ignoble privilege of being the worst of our kings, when he was stricken down at Gloucester in 1093, had his fit of repentance which, though transitory, constrained him for the time to make reparation for his evil deeds. That he should have done so in that hour of danger becomes intelligible if we think of the lessons he had learned in childhood from his pious mother and at the feet of Lanfranc. And if the faith implanted in childhood could achieve this, even in a character so abandoned as his, we need not be surprised if in hearts of finer texture it achieved nobler and more solid triumphs, as in Herluin, the founder of Bec, or Gundulph, the father of Anselm, and as in the number of those who changed their lives in the middle of their days, or in old age, or when death was near, and showed the reality of their repentance by their rigid mortifications and lavish alms.

We may have dwelt too long on this aspect of the life of Anselm, but, in view of the clear insight into some underlying mediæval habits and tendencies which his writings reveal, it has seemed a useful thing to do, though at the cost of passing over the details of his history—for these can be read elsewhere. In pursuance, too, of this method, we shall confine ourselves in what follows to a comment on the significance of the objects

for which Anselm strove with the two English sovereigns during the time of his episcopate.

It was in 1093 that he became Archbishop of Canterbury. Lanfranc had died in 1089, and since then the Red King had kept this see and many others vacant. The Norman sovereigns in introducing the feudal system insisted on a theory of tenure according to which the sovereigns had not only royal authority, but an underlying freehold in all the estates within their jurisdiction. The principal subjects were only their tenants-in-chief, and this meant that, when they died, their estates reverted to the sovereign, who held them and enjoyed their revenues until it pleased him to appoint the next tenant in succession. They found it particularly convenient to apply this theory to the bishoprics and abbacies of the kingdom. By the recognized law of the Church the founders of benefices and their heirs were the *advocati*—or, as modern lawyers would say, held the advowsons—of the same. That is, they were the recognized guardians and protectors of their respective benefices, and had as a privilege the right of nominating the incumbents. It was easy for arbitrary monarchs, who could follow their own methods of reasoning, to construe this title of advowson into a title of absolute possession, and to treat the superior benefices as in all respects their own, keeping them vacant according to their pleasure that during the interim they might draw their revenues. Of the evils that followed from this custom, one was that these Kings were no kindly landlords to the ecclesiastical tenants, but sought to squeeze as much as possible out of the farms whilst they were in their hands. And a still more serious evil was that, in the defect of Bishop and Abbot during these long and repeated vacancies, discipline became relaxed, religion decayed, and sins multiplied. It is what Eadmer expressly notices in his *Historia Novorum*. It is to the credit of William the Conqueror that when he did appoint new prelates, he chose well and abstained from all simony. But it was otherwise with Rufus, whose one idea was to sell the sees to the highest bidder, and who cared nothing for the personal character of his prelates; or rather who cared only to find such as could be counted on to support him in any subsequent depredations he might wish to make. Wishing to persist in this evil course, he naturally opposed himself to every project of effectual reform, and, if we find him insisting that Bishops must not hold councils without his leave, or have

recourse to the Holy See without his leave, or even recognize a Pope as validly appointed without his leave, we must understand that his motive for setting up these "customs," as he called them, was just this, that he might not be impeded in his oppression of the Church. If councils were held, the Churchmen would have the opportunity of devising remedial measures and combining for their due application. If the Pope's intervention were allowed, it might make it necessary for the King to yield, for those were days of faith when the spiritual power of the Holy See could be exercised with terrible effect.

There are those who regard the action of Rufus in endeavouring to enforce these "royal customs," as showing that the principle of Royal Supremacy is more ancient than the Reformation. If by Royal Supremacy they mean the theoretical doctrine that the King and not the Pope is the original fountain of spiritual jurisdiction they are mistaken, for not even William I. would have dreamt of advancing such a claim as that. But, if the term be taken to mean that the King practically claimed to be the source of all jurisdiction, spiritual as much as temporal, inasmuch as he sought to fill the Church offices with his own nominees, and govern the entire sphere of their action in the interest of his own ambition, or covetousness, or lust, then it may be truly said that William II. set a precedent which Henry VIII. only carried further by constructing for it a theoretical base. But then we would invite those disposed to favour the doctrine of Royal Supremacy to consider what were its aim and object, and its logical outcome, as seen in these two typical specimens. And, if it should be objected that the contrast between the two systems fails, at least from the point of view of aims and outcomes, since unfortunately Popes as well as Kings have used their power for evil as well as good, then we would suggest a wider outlook and the drawing of a wider inference. The power of resistance to the contagion of iniquity, and the power of recovery from its attacks, has always been greater, vastly greater, in the Holy See than in the temporal thrones of Christendom, but none the less, it must be acknowledged that there have been many worldly Popes, and some downright wicked Popes. Still, to what has this worst of evils been attributable save just to this self-same cause, the intrusion of the Court into the sanctuary? Bad Popes have been the chosen of bad electors, and bad electors have either proximately or ultimately owed their

responsible position as electors to the pressure exercised by evil-minded civil rulers, solicitous only for the advancement of their temporal and perhaps sinful interests. We do not say that this has been the sole source of the evil, but we say without hesitation that it has been the main source of it, and the inference to which our sad and age-long experience points is that Papal Supremacy—which is the key-stone of all spiritual jurisdiction—stands for the healing of the nations, but Royal Supremacy—taken in the widest extension of the term—for their demoralization. The Divine Spirit indwelling in the Church never ceases to kindle in human hearts aspirations after truth and holiness, which in their united strength cause her to be the mightiest agent on earth making for righteousness. In proportion as her operation is impeded by the spirit of the world established in her sanctuaries will the results be reduced and enfeebled. But give her complete freedom, and her spiritual potency will display itself in its fulness, and one good result will soon appear, and bear within itself the promise of all the rest; the important offices will be filled by zealous prelates, under whose administration the ranks of the clergy will be renovated throughout.

And here the reader may be asked to connect what we have been noting about the evil tendency of Royal Supremacy with the comment made at the beginning of this article on the false impression as to the religious spirit of those times under which our modern historians are apt to labour. This false impression, we said then, is due to the overlooking of the less obtrusive but not less real and potent spiritual forces which were working in the hearts of such men as Anselm and his fellows, and those who came under their influence. This false impression, we may add now, is due to a confusion of mind, which credits the Church's own system with the evil fruits of a system of practical Royal Supremacy that was at its throat. We may add, too, that herein is discernible the unity of Anselm's ministry. In his later sphere of action at Canterbury, he was striking at the very roots of an evil influence, against which in its trunk and branches he had been striking his whole life through.

It is in these reflections on the nature and significance of Royal Supremacy that we must find the justification of Anselm's gentle but unflinching resistance to the King's demands throughout the time of his episcopate. He did

not thrust himself into that office. When Rufus, in a fit of repentance during his illness at Gloucester in the spring of 1093, deferred to the general desire of his subjects, and insisted on appointing him, it was necessary to use violence in order to get the crozier between his fingers. It was not till later, and on learning that those he respected most thought it his duty to submit, that he accepted the post, and only then under protest and with the warning words "you are yoking to the same plough a weak old ewe and an untamed young bull." Nor did he omit to stipulate that the King must promise to restore to Canterbury its church property, which was neither the King's to take, nor the Archbishop's to surrender; must promise to listen to his advice in regard to all spiritual affairs; and promise to recognize Urban as Pope. It cannot be said that the King's answer was satisfactory, but Anselm had at least signified the course he should take, and the King understood. Then he was consecrated and enthroned at Canterbury on December 4, 1093.

The conflict between the two ill-assorted yoke-fellows was not long in breaking out. At the Christmas gemot the King announced his intention to invade the Norman domains of his brother Robert, and required subsidies from his chief subjects. Anselm offered 500 pounds of silver, but the King demanded double as much. Anselm perceived that he was virtually being asked to pay a simoniacal fee for his promotion, he realized also that to contribute the higher sum meant to practise unjust extortion on his tenants. So he refused, and by so doing lost the King's friendship. The tension increased a few months later when Anselm pressed the King to permit the holding of a national synod for the suppression of vice, and to provide the vacant abbeys with incumbents. By the law of the Church, already an ancient law in those days, it is the duty of a new Archbishop, unless dispensed, to go in person to Rome for his pallium within a year of his entry in the see. In the spring of 1095, Anselm reminded the King of this already over-due obligation. William replied by asking to which Pope he proposed to go, to Urban or to the anti-Pope Guibert. Anselm repeated what he had made a condition of accepting his see. He acknowledged Urban. Indeed that was the obviously right thing to do. Urban had been duly elected in the prescribed way. No claim could be more vain than Guibert's. The Emperor, Henry IV., had trumped up some baseless and absolutely ridicu-

lous charges of guilt against St. Gregory VII., and on the score of these had pretended to depose him. Then of the two Cardinals subservient to Henry one elected the other to be Pope, the Emperor approving of the selection, in virtue of a power he claimed to have received from the Holy See. And now William Rufus, resting on a claim the Norman Kings had set up that the English Crown was also a Crown imperial (not royal only), declared that he had the same right as the German Emperor to accept or reject a new Pope. In the present instance, however, the difficulty thus created did not last long. William took it into his head that he might use Urban as an instrument for circumventing Anselm; so he recognized him, and induced him to send the pallium over to England by a special legate. Thus the Archbishop received his pallium in June of the same year, and so far he and the King were reconciled.

But Anselm was not the man to shirk responsibility by leaving the scandals of the kingdom unremedied. In 1097 he again pressed the King to permit of the necessary measures for reform, and, this being again denied him, he asked respectfully for leave to go to Rome, to ask counsel of the representative of St. Peter. He was told he might go, but if he did his possessions would be confiscated and he would never be permitted to return. Also some of his fellow-bishops were sent to reason with him, but in vain. He returned with them to the King's presence, and addressed him calmly and resolutely before them all, in words that testify unmistakably to the judgment Anselm would pronounce on the question of continuity: "You command me to swear that never again whilst in England will I appeal to Blessed Peter or his Vicar, but I say that this is not a command that a Christian like you should impose. To swear this would be to forswear Blessed Peter; and he who forswears Blessed Peter, beyond doubt forswears Christ who set him over the Church as its Prince." The words were final, but there followed a touching illustration of Anselm's sweetness of manner, and of the fascination it could exercise even on a brute like Rufus. Before leaving he approached the King and said, "Lord King, I am going . . . but in the mercy of God this which has happened shall not take away my love for your soul and its salvation. And now, not knowing when I shall see you again, I commend you to God, and as a spiritual father to his beloved son, as an Archbishop of Canterbury to a King of England, I desire to impart to you, if you will not reject it, God's blessing.

and mine, before I leave you." The King replied, "I will not refuse your blessing," and then Anselm rose, and, to the astonishment of all, made the sign of the Cross over the bowed head of his sovereign, and took his departure. They never met again. Anselm left England and eventually reached Rome, welcomed with an outburst of admiration and respect in which all Christendom joined. The Red King held out stolidly for three long years, until one summer morning in 1100, when the winged arrow of Divine vengeance found him in the glades of the forest, and summoned him to the court whose verdict no man can dispute. Anselm was in Auvergne at the time, and it was characteristic of the man that when the news reached him he broke forth into bitter tears, and exclaimed amidst his sobbings that he would far rather have died himself in body than that the King should have so died in soul.

Henry I., on his accession, at once sent to beg Anselm to return, promising removal of the grievances of which he had complained. Henry's motives were perhaps not altogether pure, for, as his brother Robert still lived, his title was far from secure, and he would have been rash to dispense with the Archbishop's powerful support. Still, Henry was a better man than William, and his administration was more Christian. One great controversy with Anselm he had which necessitated another three years' exile for the latter. But it was over a different matter, and, though the King showed the tenacity of his race, he distinguished between principle and person, and was throughout on friendly terms with the Archbishop; and eventually the dispute ended in a reasonable compromise. In investing the lay-tenants with their fiefs the custom was for the King to deliver a banner as the symbol of transference, and the derived custom was to present a Bishop with the ring and a crozier. It was not intended thereby to imply any claim to confer spiritual jurisdiction, but only to confer the temporalities of the see. Still, the ring and crozier were the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and grave danger of confusion between the two jurisdictions, and consequent intrusion of the civil ruler into the domain of the spiritual, was to be feared if the ceremony were not discontinued. Accordingly Urban II., in a Council held at Rome in 1099, at which Anselm was present, had forbidden its employment. Henry I.'s difficulty was that he could not understand why what was allowed in the times of his father and brother should now be forbidden, and he

construed the prohibition into a claim to deprive him of his dominion over the temporalities. Eventually, after much parleying, Paschal II. allowed English prelates to do homage for their temporalities by kneeling before the King, and placing their hands in his while they recited the form of words; and Henry I. submitted to disuse the giving of the crozier. It was a happy settlement, and again Anselm's tact and charm of manner contributed largely to bring it about.

And now his life's chief work was done. By his saintly persistency he had gained his point, and secured for the English Church not indeed complete and secure liberty—for in the generations to come many another hard fight between Bishop and sovereign must be fought in the same cause—but a degree of liberty which sufficed for the present and saved the future from graver evils. Still there was one further work for him to do, and during the short remainder of his life, notwithstanding the exhaustion of his strength, he busied himself with his pastoral charge, and did much to cleanse the sanctuaries of the land from the foul scandals which in the days of misgovernment had polluted them. It was two years later when the summons came to him. On Palm Sunday, 1109, his brethren gathered round his bed watching him when one of them said, "Father and Lord, you will keep the Easter Court with your Lord above." And he replied, quite in his own way, and in words that testified what were the favourite subjects of his thoughts, "If it is His will I am ready. Still I should have liked to live a little longer so that I might first solve the question about the origin of the soul which I have been trying to think out. I fear that if I die no one else will bring it to a conclusion."

S. F. S.

Intolerance, Persecution, and Proselytism.

THE invidious and ill-sounding terms which form the title of this article, are never long absent from the mouths of anti-Catholic controversialists in this country, and we are likely to hear a great deal of them in the immediate future. On November 24th of last year, Mr. William Redmond, M.P., taking occasion of the resentment aroused in the minds of all reasonable men of whatever creed or party,¹ by the Government's action in regard to the Eucharistic Procession during the Congress at Westminster, asked and obtained leave from the House of Commons, by 223 votes to 48, to introduce his "Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal" Bill, which was accordingly read then for the first time. The Second Reading of this important measure will, it is hoped, be taken on the 14th of the present month, and Parliament will then have the opportunity of cleansing the Statute-Book from the last vestiges of the iniquitous Penal Laws. Various Catholic bodies throughout the country, notably the young and energetic Catholic Federation, have utilized the interval in putting before the public, plainly and emphatically, the exact character and extent of our grievances, and it seems very probable that, barring some accidental obstacle of procedure, the legislature will grant our just and reasonable claims. And we may even hope, having in view the utterances of several of its members, that the Government, as Governments can, will do its best to further this private Bill. Certain prophetic words of the present Premier, in support of Mr. Gladstone's measure of 1891 for removing one of these grievances, words which are treasured by Catholics as a guarantee of his action now that he himself can make them true, may once more be set on record here. On that occasion Mr. Asquith said :

Sixty years ago [*i.e.*, before 1829] the principle of religious exclusion was entrenched in this country behind an imposing fabric of legal

¹ See the remarkable consensus of opinion expressed by various newspapers at the time, and printed in the Report of the Congress, p.615.

safeguards and securities. One after another its strong places have been captured and its walls battered down until all that remains is this paltry little corner—the solitary and belated relic of a past which can never be rebuilt. The finger of fate is upon it, and although by your votes this afternoon [the speaker was then in Opposition] you may for a few years retard, depend upon it you cannot avert, its downfall.

The “few years” have stretched out into nearly twenty: all the more reason for the prophet to hasten the fulfilment of his prediction.

We have spoken of the chances of procedure. There is, we are aware, another obstacle which is deliberate—the rooted ill-will of a certain section of the population against what they conceive to be the belief of their Catholic fellow-subjects. In their hearts the spirit which inspired the Penal Laws—that unlovely mixture of hatred and cruelty and fear—is still alive, and it prompts them naturally to endeavour to protect the last of its offspring. One hears of the growth of a monster Protestant petition, intended to impress Parliament with the sense of a national uprising against the Bill. Parliament, we fear, through long familiarity, is petition-proof, and it is not likely to over-estimate the value of a document, already sufficiently discredited by its origin and still more by the methods employed in its compilation.¹ It is not with the view, then, of counteracting the possible effect of this offspring of mendacity, but to show, for the hundredth time it may be, the groundlessness of the common charges against the Church implied in the words at the head of this paper, that we offer the following few remarks. We must start with definitions—an indispensable preliminary if discussion is to be profitable.

The words—intolerance, persecution, and proselytism—express respectively a habit of mind and two courses of conduct to which it is likely to give rise. They are, of course, here confined to the sphere of religion. Thus, if toleration in the individual may be defined to be *a practical recognition of our neighbour's right to follow his conscience in matters of belief and conduct, provided the exercise of such right does not involve injury to social order or morality*,—which seems a fairly adequate description—then intolerance, as a consequence, is the denial of that right

¹ See in the *Tablet* for April 3rd the letter of an “Anglican Onlooker,” who stigmatizes “the idle tales and cruel slanders” that to his knowledge were being used to obtain signatures.

even so limited. And when expressed in action, it will show itself either by penalizing the neighbour for following his conscience, which is persecution, or by using unfair means to induce him to conform his conscience to another's, which is proselytism. In all three cases, the rights of conscience, of "God's aboriginal Vicar," in Newman's phrase, are practically denied, there is an unauthorized interference between the soul and its Creator, and man's essential liberty is violated. Now, it is plain that no one on his own account has a right to do this: all men in this respect are by nature perfectly equal, and if a person seeks to invade the domain of his neighbour's conscience it must be either at the invitation of its owner or by the permission, direct or indirect, of Him who alone has the absolute right of entry, Almighty God; otherwise he usurps a power to which he has no claim. It follows, then, that man's right to determine for himself in matters of faith and practice can be circumscribed only by his Creator, acting directly on the conscience or through His accredited agents to bring him to a knowledge of the truth and a love of the good, which are the proper objects of his mind and will. Yet we find the history of the world full of unauthorized intrusions into the domain of conscience both by way of persecution and proselytism, sometimes by rulers and States, sometimes by private persons, but all lusting after that inalienable territory wherein resides the human will. The fact seems to be that intolerance is natural to man, and if the world in general now finds toleration easy, that is partly due to the painful experience of centuries pointing to the sad consequences of indulgence in the opposite. In the beginning, we may conceive, it was not so. The desire man feels to have his neighbour think as he does on important matters, the resentment that arises when he finds that the neighbour does not, the purpose he conceives of making the neighbour do so if he can—all spring from his essentially social nature. He is not meant to think alone: his intellectual feebleness needs the sense of security which, in the absence of divine revelation, the reflection of his own opinions in others' minds alone can give. Granted these tendencies and any diversity of religious opinions in a community, then, intolerance is likely enough to arise. It may be urged that primitive man was not religiously intolerant, and did not persecute nor proselytize. Well, little is known about primitive man except the shape of his skull, and there is little scope for dogmatizing on its contents. But if he were not

anxious to bring his neighbour to his own belief, we may ascribe the fact to his neighbour's already sharing it. In those early tribal societies, we may suppose, civil and religious authority was in the same hands, and the tribesman did and believed as he was told by the elders without feeling that his spiritual autonomy was ignored. He did not know he had any. A certain ethical and intellectual development, and a more than vague apprehension of the claims of God were necessary before man could realize his religious independence. Until then he was a slave. Wicked rulers might command wickedness, and he had no choice but to obey, for they, no less than the good, represented the gods. And so long as primitive religions remained merely national, regarded as departments of state and as the chief bond of unity between the citizens, what could the individual do to assert his freedom? In opposing the State he would be told he was opposing the divinity. It needed divine intervention, a new objective revelation, to bring home to man the degradation into which he had fallen through admitting the claim of the civil power to spiritual domination as well. And so in Jewish history we read for the first time of martyrs for conscience' sake. Although in the nation of Israel supreme civil and religious authority was originally vested in the same person, that arrangement was made by God Himself and was guarded by His Providence against abuse. But among the Gentile peoples there was no appeal for an outraged conscience, there was no organization to support resistance to an immoral law, the State was absolute, and if the State was evil, its subjects groaned under a monstrous tyranny. The Jewish revelation did something to vindicate man's freedom, the Christian revelation came to complete and perfect the work. Christianity in proclaiming the essential unity of the human race and the essential dignity of the human soul, introduced on earth the wholly-new conception of a single world-wide religion transcending all differences of race and station and culture, divine in its origin, independent of the civil power in its constitution and within its own sphere supreme. What wonder that, on the appearance of this portent, the nations raged and the peoples devised vain things against the Lord and against His Christ. For it was a reassertion on the part of Almighty God of claims over all His creatures which He had apparently long foregone, claims which had been usurped or denied by earthly power since the beginning of time. The old order, impersonated in

the Roman Empire, fought long and bitterly against the spread of this idea, so fatal to its unjust pretensions. Rome, that boasted of her toleration and that had found room in her Pantheon for all other Eastern religions, waged war to the death against this last comer which alone was seen to threaten her usurped sway over her subjects' consciences. In the end, as we know, Rome was conquered, God's essential rights were recognized by the State, man's liberty was secured, and the double jurisdiction, human and divine, finally established.

It is worth while pausing here to notice that the conception which pagan Rome formed of the early Christians as being a race apart, foreigners in the land of their birth, and as professing doctrines incompatible with patriotism and subversive of civil liberty is precisely that which the English ultra-Protestant expresses of his Catholic fellow-citizen to-day. It is one sign amongst many that the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, resulting in the division of Christendom and the modern morbid exaggeration of nationalism, was in effect a return to the ideals of Paganism. We see in both spirits the same intuitive dread of an authority which denies State-absolutism, which does not look for support to national sanctions and which claims the unquestioning obedience of mind and heart. And both alike are blind to the fact that the Church is the best and surest support of the State, as the Roman Empire found when it became Christian and thus postponed its downfall for many generations, and that the nationalism, which ignores the common origin and destiny of all the races of men, is a sad perversion of a noble quality. The dangers of this un-Christian patriotism, which does its best to accentuate the natural rivalry of nations and commonly expresses itself in self-praise and contempt of others, are very great, and not the least is that it obscures the universal character of Christ's religion. It cannot bear that hated rivals should possess equal or greater spiritual advantages. Nothing provoked the unbelieving Jews to greater fury than our Lord's reminding them that there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elias, yet to none was he sent, but rather to a widow of Sidon. To the enmity of the Jewish-minded and prideful patriot the Church Catholic will always be exposed.

We have said that one great function of Christianity was to make and keep a clear distinction between the things of Cæsar and the things of God, and to forbid Cæsar to meddle

with the latter, thus freeing the conscience of the subject from the tyranny of the State. We have now to face the fact that the triumph of Christianity did not, in fact, mean the cessation of persecution and that the early Christian Emperors, whether Roman or Byzantine, orthodox or Arian, were as intolerant in their way as any of their Pagan predecessors. And not only that, which might be called the action of the civil authority, but the Christian Church herself set up in time the Inquisition, the whole object of which was to suppress freedom of conscience by persecuting those who asserted it. Moreover, the various sects that separated from the Church in the sixteenth century continued and extended her policy of persecution. No explanation of these facts, still less any justification of them, can be offered without explaining further what liberty of conscience really is and what, according to Catholic doctrine, is the providential mission of the Christian Church.

No one, it is plain, is absolutely free in thought, word, and action. His mental faculties are given him for the acquisition of truth and he must regulate himself in his use of them and in his general conduct by the known law of God. Of course he is physically free to ignore that law, but not morally free, *i.e.*, to its violation is attached a sanction which no efforts of his can enable him ultimately to avoid. And his mental liberty is constantly being curtailed, for every truth attained is a bar to further surmise on that particular point. Thus, once we have understood the proof which demonstrates that the interior angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles, we are no longer free to doubt it. Our liberty of speculation about the value of such angles is gone for ever. And when God has told us that His divine Nature subsists in three Persons, He has set one definite limit to our freedom of conjecture about His Essence. If we doubted before He had told us, we should not have been culpable: now we have the surest grounds for knowing, and He may punish us if we doubt or deny. Liberty of conscience, in other words, means opportunity to acquire the truth from whatever sources God has provided, and freedom to govern our lives according to it; not by any means freedom to reject or ignore it. Unless we deny all possibility of mental certitude about things divine we cannot tolerate opinions that plainly conflict with God's revelation. We must put them out of our own minds, we must ever regard them as errors in the minds of others. If this is

intolerance, it is of the kind expressed by our Lord Himself, who said of the man that should reject the witness of the Apostles to His teaching—"He that believeth not, shall be condemned." We must admit, then, that the conscious possessor of religious truth must be intolerant of religious error, otherwise he would deny his own faith and equate certitude to mere opinion. But, we may be asked, Is that any reason why such a man should make his own convictions the standard of orthodoxy and compel or persuade, if he can, his neighbour to share them? And if not, what excuse can be offered for that arch-persecutor and proselytizer, the Catholic Church? Here it becomes important to define more closely what persecution and proselytism mean. Is all application of physical force or material penalties with a view of causing or preventing or punishing change of religious belief necessarily to be called persecution? And is the word proselytism applicable to every endeavour to induce others to change their faith for ours? Neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative unless we are prepared to say that God never delegates His rights over conscience to men—an idea which the whole conception of the Catholic Church denies. It is on this point of primary importance that the Protestant view differs from ours. By their position they are compelled to look upon the Church as a human institution, with no divine commission to instruct and guide the world in religious matters and no divine guarantee against failure in her office. But, although they are entitled to their view until they see adequate reason to change it, they are equally obliged to treat our convictions with the like consideration. We maintain that there is evidence to show conclusively that Christ established an infallible Church to endure to the end of time, with power to perpetuate the work of the Incarnation, to instruct and direct the consciences of men in matters of faith and morals, to judge, remit, and exact penalties for sins committed, and to proclaim His message to all the nations of the earth. Here, then, are two opposed convictions, both professedly based on historical investigation, and therefore on Protestant principles, both, if sincerely held, equally worthy of respect. How, then, do Protestants justify their assumption that their view is necessarily correct and ours necessarily wrong? It is a case of reason arrayed against reason, and there is no arbiter on earth to decide. Surely toleration is the only rational attitude for them to adopt, unless they wish themselves to claim

the prerogatives they deny to Catholicity. It is otherwise with the Church. It must be far otherwise with an institution which claims to be the abode of the unerring Spirit of God. According to her Founder's commands she must teach His doctrine always and everywhere—woe to her if she preach not the Gospel; she must teach as He taught “with authority;” she must condemn, as He did, all who consciously owe and refuse her obedience. If Christ our Lord had actually remained on earth as visible head of His Church instead of appointing a man as His Vicar, can He be imagined as teaching otherwise than she has taught? Are not the woes He denounced against the unbeliever strangely like the Church's anathemas?¹ Did He not bid His followers to treat the contumacious as a heathen and a publican? to excommunicate him? Yes, we may be told, but where did Christ command the torturing and killing of heretics? Would He have set up the Inquisition if He had remained on earth? If not, how can that Church be His, which did set up such a tribunal, the main office of which was to coerce the consciences of men? These are very natural questions, and are by no means to be evaded by the Catholic apologist. But it would be impossible to attempt an exhaustive answer to them here, nor is it to our purpose to do so. It is enough if we point out the principles on which an Inquisition of some sort is justifiable, and the causes which explain the character and the undoubted excesses of the tribunal as we know it in history.

The first point to notice is that the establishment of the Inquisition may be shown to be an altogether mistaken policy on the part of the Church without thereby invalidating her claim to be the Church of Christ. He never guaranteed His Church against errors in administration: it is generally agreed, for instance, that St. Pius V. made the plight of Catholics worse by his excommunication of Elizabeth. Nor did He undertake to preserve her institutions from occasional abuse, for the Papacy itself has been abused by unprincipled men. All that He

¹ As an instance of the fatuity that passes for logic with some defenders of the blasphemous Royal Declaration we recall an argument in a Protestant leaflet to this effect:—that the King utters only one curse against a rival Belief, whereas that Belief, in the Council of Trent, pronounces no fewer than 153 against *its* rivals! If the King claimed to be infallible there might be some point in the parallel, whereas the Church's *anathema sit*, pronounced against a will in conscious rebellion, is merely equivalent to some such phrase as—“he who thinks otherwise is a fool”—with which Euclid might have condemned weak intellects at the conclusion of each of his propositions.

promised was that she should never cease to exist, should always be guided in her teaching by His Spirit, and should never therefore lead His flock astray into false pastures. For the rest, the Church is composed of human beings, and therefore, outside the limits implied in those Divine promises, is exposed to human frailties. The history of the Inquisition in Spain, for instance, shows that, just like the secular courts of law, it often suffered from the abuses to which its procedure laid it open, that it was used to satisfy avarice and glut private enmities, that its officials were not always above suspicion in their motives, that its penalties were often arbitrary, unjust, and cruel. But these facts in themselves are no proof that it was not good in its conception and beneficial in its general results; if that contention is established, it must be on other grounds.

Secondly, the Church never sanctioned the use of force, as Mahomet did, to win adherents to her creed. She understood her Lord's injunction—Compel them to come in—as implying moral persuasion alone. She exercised her coercive powers only on those who were already under her jurisdiction. The word "heretics" in her eyes meant merely rebellious or apostate Catholics. We are not saying that Christian monarchs did not sometimes in their zeal for the faith, or from some political motive, by means of the Inquisition or otherwise, try to force outsiders to join the true fold. The Church is not committed by such acts of violence, which she did not sanction.

Thirdly, the use of physical violence to prevent or punish apostasy did not originate with the Church. In days when heresy was looked on as a crime against the State as well as an offence against God, secular Governments were keen to suppress its manifestations. Many hold that the Church was wrong in consenting to avail herself of the "secular arm:" it is a question whether she had any choice. In very many cases, moreover, the early heresies were so subversive of morality and social order that the State had to suppress them for its own sake.

Fourthly, in the days of the Inquisition, after as well as before the Reformation, the use of torture to elicit evidence was universal, and the application of physical penalties for supposed religious offences was considered the natural thing. Persecution, as we call it, was an accepted principle on all sides: men were so earnest in their beliefs that they were ready to kill or to be killed in testimony of them. We must admit that in its pro-

cedure the Inquisition did not generally rise above the spirit of its time. Still, it is only fair to judge it by that spirit.

Lastly, it cannot be denied that the Church, regarding herself as a complete autonomous society, was justified in claiming the right of legislation for her members, and the correlative right of enforcing that legislation by penal sanctions. She could justly attach spiritual penalties, temporal and external as well as supernatural, to the breach of her laws. She could command or prohibit under pain of mortal sin, *i.e.*, of eternal damnation; she could excommunicate and withhold the benefits of her communion. To a body vested with such awful powers, it seems little to allow the right of physical constraint as well, but the Church has never expressly claimed it.¹ Except for her alliance with the State, we may well believe she would never have consented to use it. Whatever be her relations with civil governments in the future, we may safely say she will not countenance it again.

We have seen that if tolerance means the refusal to give religious error the same consideration as truth, Catholics must be intolerant in their thoughts. On his own principles the Protestant can only say of his religious beliefs—"I hold this for certain: my reason tells me you are wrong in holding the opposite: but, after all, you *may* be right, for subjective impressions are not infallible."² But the Catholic states his position thus: "I am certain of this on the strength of God's word; in holding the opposite you cannot possibly be right." So much for mental attitude. What about its expression in act? The Catholic maintains that conscience is so free that no one but God has a right to interfere with it. He affirms, moreover, that in addition to His immediate intercourse with the soul, God has established the Church as the channel of His graces, and the depository of His revelation. He owns the right of the Church, as God's representative to teach and to judge, and if need be to punish him. He knows too, that the Church claims jurisdiction over none except those of her fold, and he stigmatizes as persecution all annoyance inflicted on persons on account of their

¹ See Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, p. 249 and following, where this thesis is stated and proved.

² How inconsistent, therefore, is Protestant bigotry! It may be that it is a suspicion of falseness to their principles that makes so many of them seek justification in political motives. Indeed, the average bigot seems to be incensed against "Romanism," not so much through zeal for God's glory as by an extraordinary notion that the spread of Catholic principles would mean decline in material prosperity—the old "brass-money and wooden-shoes" argument.

religion by those who have no religious authority over them. And as for proselytism, he hates and condemns it as generally understood, holding that no end justifies the use of iniquitous means, and that to trade upon the helplessness or indigence of others in order to induce them to change their creed is a diabolical perversion of a good instinct.¹ No true Catholic ever proselytizes. His respect and love for his faith is such that he will have no one embrace it who does not also respect and love it for its own sake. But the Church must needs yearn for the conversion of all outside her fold, and she must omit no opportunity of letting them know her true character and the force of her claims. She is not surprised at finding herself misrepresented—"If they have called the goodman of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household"—but she is confident, and she has history to justify her, that no clouds of calumny are thick enough to shroud to the end her innate truth and beauty from men of good-will.

J. K.

¹ Proselytism is still at work amongst the poor in Italy and Ireland, engineered by certain Protestant societies, with the support, or at least without the condemnation, of the Protestant Hierarchy. It was seen, perhaps, in its most revolting form in the latter country during the great famine, when depôts filled with food were opened in the most destitute districts, and the hapless people were offered the alternative of perversion or starvation. See *Faith and Famine*, by Rev. P. S. Dinneen

On a Western Island.

IN the distance it looks like the side of a great whale, does the western island whereon we spent a month of summer days last year, heaved out of the depths, and lying on the waters of the Atlantic.

Drawing nearer, the fissures in the grey rock appear, wherein there is a show of vegetation, but taken as a whole it is a great grey slab, washed for more than half the year by a leaden sea, only a shade less dark in colour than the rock itself.

There is no quay on its shores. Elsewhere along the coast of Galway and of Mayo, the Congested District Board has built up piers and made harbours, more or less useful for the fishing-fleets, but our Inish has not been so favoured. True, there is not a man upon it who owns a fishing-ketch, but whether the fact that no boat drawing more water than a curragh approaches the shore is the cause or the effect of having no safe landing-place is uncertain. A steamer from Galway passes once a week, a little puffing, plunging mail-boat which anchors in the sandy bay to the east, and disgorges her cargo into the waiting curraghs that crowd around her.

They are the quaintest of little craft, these coracles of the western seas, made of interlaced laths, thin enough to be pliable, and covered with a tightly-drawn coating of tarred canvas. There is no difficulty in moving them, for they are so light that a man can easily carry one upon his shoulders, and when out of use they lie in rows, turned upside down, and placed well above high-water mark. The oars are merely straight, narrow laths, each one with a hole pierced in it, through which a single rowlock passes. A flat wooden dipper is fastened in the bows, for one knock against a jagged rock would open the frail, canvas-covered sides, and the safety of the crew depends on the use of this bailing-dish. Not perhaps the whole safety, for in every boat, close beside the dipper, and as universal as that indispensable article itself, hangs a bottle of holy water, blessed by the priest for the fishermen whose hope is in God Himself more surely than in their own skill, or in any merely human means of rescue from a watery grave.

There is great method in the way these curraghs approach the steamer. They range themselves in a long line, broadside against her, two or more near enough to catch the sacks and barrels they have come to fetch, yet far enough to be out of danger in case of any sudden lurch on the part of the larger vessel.

As each curragh receives its full cargo it shoots out of the line, and whilst the next one takes its place it makes for the shore, bobbing like a cork on the crest of the great Atlantic swells at one moment, and then hidden away again in a shimmering blue-green trough of water.

Flour and salt and Indian meal, barrels of porter not a few, and parcels of every shape and size were thrown out on the day of our arrival amidst such noise and bustle that it was some moments before we realized why we understood no word of the islanders' talk.

They were speaking in Gaelic, and we were absolutely ignorant of our mother-tongue. That was on the day of our arrival, when in a moment of agonizing terror we, as well as the bundles and provisions, were cast out of the mail-boat into a waiting curragh, passing from blue-clad arms, reminiscent of fish and tar, to white-clad ones to which the aroma of turf-smoke clung.

Before the day came for us to be cast back again on to the deck of the steamer our ignorance was somewhat less. The language itself remained beyond our powers of understanding, but the greetings are too graceful and too touching to leave altogether unlearned.

Soon when we met our friends—and after the first day they were all our friends upon the Inish—we could greet them as we ourselves were greeted.

“God and Mary with you, also Patrick.”

“Blessings on you.”

“Greetings to you.”

“God be with you.”

Or when we entered a house, “God bless all here” soon came to us as naturally as the words that were expected of us in the field or on the shore: “God’s blessing on the work.”

During our stay we had many conversations with the best Irish speaker on the island. He has travelled, and read, and thought. He is a bachelor and a philosopher, and, as befits an old sailor, a handy man all round. We found him mending sails, and he showed us an elaborately tucked shirt which he had made for himself and stitched in a way that many a

seamstress might envy. If we spoke of sails, then so did he, but when we questioned him on other subjects his tongue was loosened, and he told us of things which, coming from a simple fisherman, were little short of marvellous. Our landlady said that we spoke "the Beurla," but the old sail-maker indignantly denied our right to call the English language by this title.

"Beurla," he said, "means a language—any language—but when the English came they told the Irish that Gaelic was nothing but a dialect, English was *the* language of the world, and to curry favour with the oppressors, some Irish pretended to believe this story, and so the abuse crept in."

There was a rival teacher even in that small place, a young man who also claimed to have travelled.

"So far as Galway, maybe," said our old friend, with the contempt of a man who had really been twice round the world for one who vaunts a three hour journey. "He has the Irish—an' why wouldn't he, born, bred, and reared on the Inish, but sorra beauty of the old tongue has he in it. God help the ignorance o' the likes of him."

Learning that the younger man was a Patriot, we discreetly avoided politics; nevertheless, unasked, he expounded to us his views on Home Rule.

"Will it make much difference on the Inish when we get it?" we inquired meekly.

"Difference, is it? You may be talkin'!" Instinctively we felt that he was assuming his platform manner. "When we have Home Rule, won't every man do as he likes—an' if he don't, we'll *make* him do it."

Perhaps, indeed, in an out-of-the-world spot like the Inish, home government might be of even more benefit than it will be in places nearer to civilization. Certainly the English rule, as shown to us on "session day," was carried out under difficulties.

The court, a room about fifteen feet square, was crammed with eager listeners, and it was only through the kindly intervention of a huge policeman that we were able to make our way in, and seat ourselves on stools inside the railing which enclosed the two magistrates—one local and one imported—the people they were examining, and the interpreter.

"Do you understand English?" was the first question asked of an old man, with a beard like a venerable goat.

"Not one word, your worship," rolled out the answer, which called forth an excusable exclamation from the magistrate who was trying to get through two hours' work in the short hour

allowed him by the steamer on which he had to return to the mainland. The goat-like offender's words could not be taken as literally true, nevertheless, although surprisingly few of the inhabitants "have no English," scarcely any of them could undertake in a foreign tongue the special pleading needful in the cases of trespassing—where there are no visible boundary marks—or of assault, following on the arrival of a fresh supply of whiskey barrels, which principally occupy the bench.

The case of the day was one of these latter. Even the windows were blocked with eager faces when it was brought forward.

"Was the language—that was uttered—upon this occasion of a nature—calculated to prove defamatory to the—young lady's—good character?" So was one witness examined by the bland and leisurely stipendiary. The answer came immediately.

"I'm sure I couldn't say, sir."

"Bad scan to him and his English," we were close behind the interpreter and therefore had the benefit even of his asides. "Was it bad, ugly names he was calling her?" he asked aloud.

This threw much more light upon the case and the answer came even more glibly than before, for the witness, understanding, was only too anxious to tell all.

"It was indeed, sir: he called her a——"

But now even the magistrate was roused.

"Thank you, thank you," he interposed hastily. "It is quite unnecessary for you to repeat the words he used."

The fate of what had once been a cuckoo clock next occupied the attention of the bench. The mangled remains, gathered up in a woman's apron were laid before the magistrates, and then accuser and accused were given their say.

Bartle Costelloe began by denying the offence, but being put on oath he changed his plea and said if he did give the clock a tip, in any case it was no good.

"It was good enough for you yourself to send into Galway for four pen'orth of copper wire to make a pendulum," interrupted the owner indignantly.

"'Twas no good, your worship," repeated Bartle unmoved. "'Twas moth-eaten that it was, and you'd want to warm it by the fire e'er ever you'd make it go."

Then came Coleman Flagherty's statement.

"It was me own clock, your worship, that's before you now, and isn't it a show after him. 'Twas a wag, that's what it was, an' doesn't Bartle come in, an' it hangin' on the wall. 'What's the bright face thing?' says he. 'What is it but me wag

o' the wall' says I. An' with that he went for it—me darlin', bright face jimmy coocoo—an' he pegged it onto the floor, an' he kicked it round the kitchen. 'Bartle' says I, 'you 'll pay for this.' 'When I have to pay for it,' says he, 'I'll kick the stuffing out of it.' He did indeed, your worship, an' worse saving your favour. 'I'll kick the d——l out of it,' says he. An' with that he set to, an' he kicked it, back, body an' sides and made bits o' the lovely face and glass of it. Not a hand did he leave on it, no, nor an arm neither." Finally the magistrates decided to impose a fine, with compensation for the clock. "Have you the money to pay?" so the offender was questioned. "Mucha, divil a penny, not till the kelp boat comes in," said Bartle unconcernedly. "Then you'll have to go to gaol for a week." We thought the sentence somewhat severe, but the magistrates knew their people best.

From a dozen pockets and more—including that of the clock owner himself—came the amount in coppers and in sixpences.

So the fine was paid and the magistrate departed to Galway alone.

Ten days later the boat came from Glasgow to take away the kelp, and Bartle Costelloe was the possessor of ready money. Then the loan was repaid to the last farthing—maybe with the interest of a glass of porter here and there.

The business at the public-houses however was slack during our stay, and from an old man in a lonely cottage over the island we learnt the reason.

"I haven't been into town this long time," he told us. "We had a mission here this while back."

As "the town" consisted of a public-house and three other cottages we were able to put our own connection between these apparently irrelevant sentences.

"Did many take the pledge?" we asked.

"Many! you may well be sayin' so! Didn't we all take it!" The remembrance was seemingly not an altogether happy one.

"Did you take it for long?"

"I took it for life. I usually *does* take it for life," he said.

"What kind of a priest gave the mission?" we enquired.

"Oh, the grandest kind of a priest," he assured us.

"But was he a Dominican priest, or a Redemptorist, or a Franciscan?" we explained.

"I'll tell you the kind of priest he was," replied the old man. "The feet were bare, an' there was no hair on the head of him, but he wore his whisker."

Certainly the Capuchin's ministry had been crowned with success, to judge by the fervour of the congregation on Sunday. As the long sermon was preached in Irish, we had time to note the wrapt attention on the upturned faces as the listeners sat or stood on the mud floor of the bare chapel whilst the priest spoke, never pausing for a single word, for over half an hour. The women, red-petticoated, bareheaded, shrouded in fawn-coloured shawls were to one side. The men and boys stood at the other. It looked as though they wore some uniform, so universal was their costume. A navy blue jersey, a cream-coloured, sleeveless coat, made of "bawneen," the island flannel, a wide sash round the waist, preferably of red and yellow stripes, and trousers of white or grey homespun. Almost everyone on the island wears a curious kind of footgear called "pampooties," which is a corruption of the Spanish word for slippers. They are made of cowhide, moulded to the shape of the foot when wet with sea-water, and roughly bound together with a narrow strip of leather and so fastened round the ankle. The hair is left on the outside of the hide and though the pampooties are soft and pliant to the foot they are a great protection when the ground is rough and stony.

And all the island is not a smooth rock. To the east there is a fringe of sand and shingle, whilst westward the ground rises into high cliffs, which straight, clean cut, drop down hundreds of feet into the Atlantic. Then the glittering silvery waters stretch away to the horizon, for there is nothing but air between our western island and America.

Here and there the loose rocks have been gathered into walls, and tireless industry has created tiny fields between the grey ramparts where the crops grow up extraordinarily well.

And the wild flowers—sea-pinks and big, blushing convolvulus cling even to the face of the cliffs. The deep brilliant crimson of the wild geranium shows everywhere above the creeping briar-rose, whose clustering yellow blossoms border the crevices where the maiden-hair ferns find shade. The ground in the hollows is golden with yellow rattle and asphodel. Pink mallows grow wherever there is shelter. Campion, white and graceful, Lady's slippers and Lady's bedstraw, orchis of every shade, belated primroses, and innumerable others are trampled under our feet. Two plants that do not grow wild elsewhere are to be found on the island. One is the flowering leek, the other the trailing hop. Antiquarians maintain that these are relics of the past, plants that once flourished in the

gardens of the monks who in bygone ages lived and prayed and studied here. The ruins of their cells and chapels still remain. It is interesting to find that the nameless fascination of the Inish was felt and appreciated all those centuries ago—or perhaps it may be that some fragrance from those lives of mortification and praise of God still lingers and creates the atmosphere of attraction.

Added to this there is freedom in the very air one breathes, such sweet soft air that even when risen to a gale never buffets one like eastern winds. When the breakers are dashing on the rocks below the Black Fort, when in the distance the cliffs of Moher are white with foam, the wind even in its strength is soft and invigorating.

Our island, without one day of storm, is not the island we have learned to love. Climbing the hill behind "the town" and following the shelter of loose stone walls, we came one day upon the pigeon-holes where the sea was bursting through the ground, tossing its foam high in the air, with the waves swirling in the caverns at our feet, and beating with thunderous cadence underground.

The cliffs, usually grey and dreary, were clad in white. There was a ray of sunshine—the watery sun that comes after a storm—and the mountains of water glimmered silvery and vivid green before they broke to white, and fell away in foam.

It was a magnificent scene. We were exhilarated, yet almost overpowered by the grandeur, the infinity of it all. Our real good-bye was said then and there. Next morning all was changed. Sunshine bathed the coast of Galway, glistened on the blue-green of the bay, lighted the greyness of the island, and all the world looked glad. We had many friends to see us off as we took our seats regretfully for the last time in Coleman Conneally's curragh.

In spite of the sunshine, our hearts were heavy at the thought of what we were leaving behind. But as one brown hand after another was stretched out to give us God-speed, the greetings of our friends brought comfort to us. No one said good-bye on the day that we left the Inish. Their parting wishes have no exact English translation. The French *au revoir*, and the *auf wiedersehen* of the Fatherland express their meaning more nearly. "God have you in His keeping," they said in Gaelic, "until you return to us once more."

ALICE DEASE.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

The Jesuit Bogey in excelsis.

THE following extract is taken from a letter written by Dr. George Oliver, of Exeter, to Dr. T. J. Brown, then Prior of Downside, later Bishop of Newport and Menevia, May 10, 1838, and gives some amusing instances of the lengths to which our grandfathers were capable of going when obsessed by the Jesuit bogey.

. . . Your Orange neighbour, it appears, has not decided as yet whether the wretches who crucified our Blessed Lord were monks or Maynooth priests. I have heard almost as strange tales of those arch-Jesuits: that it was proved in a book formerly in Adam's library, that a Jesuit disguised as a serpent was the tempter of our first parents; that another of the Confraternity set fire to Sodom and Gomorrah with an electrical machine; that another Jesuit called Haman, plotted the extermination of the Jewish people. Old Prynne would have it, that his ears would never have been cropt by the Star Chamber, had it not been for the Jesuits. Du Moulin discovered 650 Jesuits exercising on dromedaries by moonshine on Hampstead Heath (*Cath. Apology*, p. 28). Many believed, or affected to believe, that Cromwell had at least 500 Jesuits in his army, and that the very executioner of Charles I. was one of their Reverend Fathers.

But the extent of their riches was the most amusing circumstance, and the calculation, but four years ago, went the round of the London and provincial papers. I cut it out of an Irish journal. The yearly rental of the Jesuits before their Suppression was two hundred and seventy-three millions sterling!!! Mr. Scott, a good financier, will divide that sum by 20,000 (the number of members), and will allot a pretty round sum to each.

Such trash reminds me of a remark in one of Mr. Bulwer's publications, that Major Grafton Munchausen would do well to digest. "When the world has once got hold of a lie, how hard it is to get it out of the world. You beat it about the head until it seems to have given up the ghost, and the next day it is as healthy as ever." But to have done with such folly.

"Mr. Scott," mentioned at the close of the second paragraph, is Father William Dunstan Scott, O.S.B., at that time Bursar at Downside, and well known as a very able man of business.

"Major Grafton Munchausen" is a Major A. Grafton, residing in Bath, Secretary of a Protestant Association, and at the time engaged in a heated controversy with Dr. Brown, who made him cut a very sorry figure.

H. N. B.

Nonconformist Unity.

We are accustomed to the claim of our Anglican brethren to realize in their community that union which Christ prayed might be the distinguishing mark of His Church. They sing with great earnestness

We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in faith and worship,
One in charity.

But facts are facts, and the fine optimism of the celebrated hymn is shivered when confronted with them. Are Dr. Gore and Canon Henson one in their idea of the character of the Anglican priesthood? Clearly not. But if not, which holds the true Anglican doctrine? The answer at once splits the Anglicans into two parties—the sacerdotalists and the non-sacerdotalists. And similarly of other important matters of belief. Still, amongst the members of the Establishment as contrasted with Protestant Dissenters, we can trace some semblance of unity; they have one hierarchical system, the same prayer-book, the same government. We can tell within a measurable distance what an Anglican Churchman professes to believe. But call a man a Dissenter, and what do you convey as to his creed? He may be a Unitarian, or a Baptist or a Quaker or a Believer in Joanna Southcott or a member of any one of the 300 odd sects that *Whitaker* used to enumerate for our edification; each of which sects owed its origin to some diversity of faith or practice, some spiritual need which was not satisfied by its predecessors, some view of the relations between God and man not previously entertained. Or if he is an American believer (we are told that only a little over one-third of that great nation is enrolled on Church books) his creed will still need a fuller definition. Apropos of a recent religious census, the *New York Times* says:

If there is any American who cannot find a religious denomination to suit him, he must be too fastidious for this earth. For this latest report shows that the denominations number 155—and probably no

living man, however well versed in religious matters, can enumerate from memory half that number. Among the little known names on this list are the "Old-Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination Baptists," who boast more than 12,000 members; the "Bruederhoef Mennonites" and the "Defenceless Mennonites," the Schwankfeldians, the Icelandic Lutherans, &c.

Most of these smaller denominations have split from larger groups. Of the latter the Lutherans afford the greatest variety; twenty-four sects are listed in addition to eighty-three independent Lutheran congregations. Seemingly, the latter could not find a congenial association in any of the twenty-four varieties. Methodists rank next in diversity, with eighteen divisions, the Baptists following with fourteen bodies. Of denominations claiming the general title "Brethren" there are fourteen, but they seem not to be brotherly enough to get along with one another. Of the "split P's," as the Presbyterian sects are called, there are an even dozen.

It would, one would think, require a bold man to boast, under the circumstances, of the Unity of the Free Churches. Well, that bold man is forthcoming; our readers have heard of him before: he is Dr. Horton, of Hampstead. Hitherto he has been distinguished for his power of inventing fables about the religion of other people: lately he has tried his hand upon his own, and this is the result:

Roman Catholics made a charge against Protestants that Protestantism was divided into innumerable sects. He himself would admit that he little cared for all those names and denominations, and whilst he would gladly part with the whole lot of them and call themselves Free Churchmen, he would say to those who made that charge that they greatly misunderstood the situation. In the case of the Free Churches it was a *division of names* and not of spirit or belief. There was no body of Catholicism anything like so unified in belief and in spirit as the body of Nonconformists in England. They could not gather together a Catholic Congress with the same unanimity and the same spontaneous agreement as they had in the Free Church Council. They were absolutely one in the spirit and the faith, but that was not so with the Catholics. The Roman Church was seethed (?seething) and wrecked with fundamental divisions and bitter hatreds. What they discovered in the Catholic Church was that its unity was all external: it was all false. It was not the unity of the spirit, nor was it the bond of peace.¹

This is certainly a blow from an unexpected quarter, and Dr. Horton is to be congratulated on the dexterity with

¹ Dr. Horton at Godalming: *The Surrey Times*, April 10th.

which he diversifies his attacks. We thought that at least what our Anglican friends call the rigid uniformity of Rome was safe, but that now, as well as our title of Catholic, is to be taken from us. The best comment we can offer on the latter portion of the above passage is taken from the beginning of the same address, viz., "The grave misfortune of a Protestant country was that it knew so little about the Roman Church." And we may add that Dr. Horton will continue personally to suffer that misfortune if he takes as his sources of knowledge about Catholicity the writings of heretics who have been expelled from her communion. It was evidently from their rebellious utterances that he drew his singular statement that the trend of Catholicity was to worship the Pope! As regards his statement about the unity of Nonconformity, it is really too grotesque. The fissiparous nature of the Protestant principle is not to be explained away as being a mere æsthetic preference for a particular label. A man, for instance, does not take the momentous step of deserting the plain variety to become a Bunyan Baptist, solely out of love of alliteration. Nothing but the stress of deep religious conviction, we feel sure, could compel such heroism. Of course, if the Doctor, as we suspect he does, would consider the one sufficient bond of unity the tenet that each man may believe what he thinks good provided he is sincere, the Free Churches are indeed one. But not in the unity of faith for which our Lord prayed.

J. K.

St. Anselm's Doctrine.

At Canterbury on April 22nd, the Archbishop of Westminster, preaching on the Centenary of St. Anselm, said :

Take his works, translate them into the English of the present day, place them before the eyes and in the hands of the Catholics of England of the present time, without any suppression, without emendation, without explanation, and it would be found that they were absolutely acceptable to them.

For these words "a Canon of Canterbury" exults over his Grace in the *Times* for April 24. "It is dangerous," he says, "for the Archbishop to speak as if he had read them all [*i.e.* St. Anselm's works] when he has not," and then he quotes the following passage from the *Cur Deus Homo* (i. 16) as proving

that St. Anselm was in disagreement with us as to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady.

Although the conception of this Man [*i.e.* the *Deus Homo* of the Dialogue] is strictly clean and free from the sin that accompanies the pleasure of the flesh, yet the Virgin from whom He is taken was herself conceived in iniquities, and her mother conceived her in sin, and she was born with original sin, because she also sinned in Adam, in whom all sinned.

The Archbishop does not appear to have claimed that he had read every sentence of St. Anselm's works, nor was it necessary he should have done so. He had read enough to know what the doctrinal character of those works is, and enough to know that Anselm was a Catholic to the backbone, who fully recognized the doctrinal authority of the Church in communion of the Holy See. Nor is there anything in this passage from the *Cur Deus Homo*, which, as coming from a writer of this mind, a modern Catholic would not find "absolutely acceptable." True, the passage does prove that Anselm held that our Lady was "conceived with original sin." The words, indeed, are assigned to the interrogator Boso, not to Anselm, but Anselm, as the writer, evidently means us to take them as supplying an argumentative premiss which both admitted. Still the Canon, if he undertakes to pronounce what *we* should consider acceptable or unacceptable, should give us credit for our views on doctrinal development. It is necessary to distinguish always between principles and the inferences drawn from them, between doctrinal propositions and the precise sense in which they are to be taken. The labour of study and reflection during the course of ages clears away many of the obscurities on these points under which previous generations laboured. It is the very object of theology to do that, and the very purpose of the Church's authoritative decrees is to impart her sanction to those of the inferences and interpretations thus arrived at which she judges to be valid. The history of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception—as the Canon had he, before writing to the *Times*, consulted a few of our books, or even the Bull *Ineffabilis*, would have found out easily—is a signal illustration of this process of successful theological reflection which the Holy See has finally approved. Two points about our Blessed Lady were firmly held, long at all events before the time of St. Anselm, one that her soul was adorned by God with all the grace and purity which under God could be given to a creature; the

other, that all that she had she owed to the Redemption of her Divine Son. These conditions presupposed, the question arose what kinds and degrees of grace could she be deemed to have had or not to have had. That no creature, human or angelic, ever received so much or such choice grace was acknowledged, as it was easy to understand how she could receive this through the merits of her Son. But in regard to the grace of original justice, that is, of exemption from original sin, there was a difficulty. If she were not born in original sin, could she have stood in any need of redemption? The early theologians thought not, and this was the reason why they held that she was born in original sin—and Anselm among them. But as theological reflection progressed, theologians began to see that this difficulty could be removed by a distinction. What the doctrine of original sin involved was that each one of Adam's posterity had lost his title to receive the grace which, apart from the Fall, would have been accorded to him at the moment when, by the infusion of the soul into the body, he became a living person. Through the merits of Redemption this grace was restored, but by our Lord's appointment, according to His ordinary law, only in Baptism, that is after birth. Still grant that Mary received it by special exception—to fit her the better to be the tabernacle in which her Son was to rest—before Baptism, or at the moment when it would have been given to all of us apart from the Fall. Then she would indeed have contracted the debt of original sin like others, and to that extent have "sinned in Adam," but she would have been preserved entirely from the consequences, inasmuch as there was then no moment of her life, not even the first, when she was without grace; and yet she would owe all to the Redemption of her Son. Further, if this were possible without infringing on her quality as one of the Redeemed, must it not be held to have taken place, in virtue of the other principle that she received the highest graces which God could give to a created being; greater, therefore, than what He gave to the angels? The Church by her solemn decision has decided that this must be held.

To return to St. Anselm, is there anything in his writings to lead us to suppose he would have been violently opposed to this inference? It will be noticed that in the passage quoted by the anonymous Canon, St. Anselm does not commit himself to any such violent opposition. All he is there solicitous about is that our Lord's birth from a mother of the posterity of Adam

did not involve Him in sin, and that she and all others born before Him were redeemed by their faith in His death as to come. But let us turn from his *Cur Deus Homo* to his *De Conceptu Virginali*.¹ There we read :

Although the Son of God was truly conceived of a most pure Virgin, this was not because it was impossible for a just offspring to be conceived by this mode of propagation from a sinful mother, but because it was becoming that that Man should be conceived of a most pure mother. It was becoming, that is to say, that she should shine with a purity greater than which none under God could be, she the Virgin to whom God the Father had decreed to give his only Son whom he had begotten equal to Himself that He might be by nature at the same time Son of the Father and Son of the Virgin.

In short here we have St. Anselm himself laying down the very principle from which, as we have said, the dogmatic conclusion was eventually drawn. When we add that Eadmer, the disciple of St. Anselm, in his *De Conceptione Sanctae Mariae*, actually draws this conclusion,² we may assume that the inference is not likely to have been in violent conflict with St. Anselm's ideas, and we may think that the Canon (was it Canon Mason?) was not over happy in fixing on Anselm as an opponent of the dogma. X.

Reviews.

I.—THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.³

IT is probably owing to the nature of the subject and not to any carelessness or incompetence on the part of the contributors, that the third volume of this important work falls somewhat short of its predecessors in point of interest. The minute thoroughness with which the whole field is mapped out, the general completeness of the bibliographical information remain as conspicuous as ever. We are not indeed sure that such external periodicals as *Anglia*, the *Englische Studien*, and *The Proceedings of the Modern Language Association of America*,

¹ C. 16.

² See, on this point, Father Thurston's articles in *THE MONTH* for July and December, 1904.

³ *The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. III. *Renaissance and Reformation*. Cambridge. Pp. xii, 588. Price 9s. net. 1909.

have always been quite as diligently conned as they deserved to be, but over and over again we are left in admiration at the painstaking accumulation of references and the compendious digests of information not easily to be found elsewhere. Chapter V. entitled "The Progress of Social Literature in Tudor Times," a section which deals with mock testaments, satires on women, jest books, riddles, broadsides, witchcraft, and superstitions, might be instanced as a case in point. The writer of the chapter, Mr. H. V. Routh, has also added a most valuable bibliography embracing an extraordinary variety of details, even though the witchcraft section does not strike us as quite up to date. The name, by the way, of the author of the monograph on Jean Bodin is misprinted *Bandrillart*. Another excellent piece of work is the chapter on the "Mirror for Magistrates" by J. W. Cunliffe, as is also that contributed by Professor Kölbing on "Barclay and Skelton—early German influences on English Literature." Chapter xix., which bears the heading "English Universities, Schools and Scholarship in the Sixteenth Century," by W. H. Woodward, again comes as a pleasant surprise, and illustrates the unconventional lines upon which the whole undertaking is planned. We confess that in this and in the following chapter, on "the Language from Chaucer to Shakespeare," we should have expected to find something said upon the pronunciation of the classical tongues, concerning which there was a controversy which occupied much of the attention of such students as Erasmus, Cheke, Thomas Smith, Gardiner, and Cheney, and which contributed not a little to the isolation of English scholarship at a later date. Indeed, the space given to the question of English pronunciation, on pp. 459—461, might also, it seems to us, have been extended with advantage.

Turning to those topics which form the normal contents of a treatise on literary history, we may express our regret that the highly important writings of Sir Thomas More should not have fallen into more sympathetic hands than those of Professor Lindsay. It is true that the religious bias which makes his contributions to the Reformation volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* such irritating reading is here kept in restraint, but his appreciation of More falls very far short of the discernment perceptible in such an article as that of Mr. R. Morison in the January number of the *Scottish Historical Review* recently referred to in these pages. The quality of the other principal

contributions is sufficiently guaranteed by the well-known names of their authors. The longest chapter in the volume is that of Dr. W. J. Courthope upon the poetry of Edmund Spenser, an excellent piece of work. Dr. Sidney Lee writes on the "Elizabethan Sonnet," and Professor Saintsbury on "Prosody from Chaucer to Spenser," and also on "Elizabethan Criticism." Other useful chapters are those of Mr. C. Whibley on "Chroniclers and Antiquaries," (in which by the inclusion of John Speed we are carried as far forward as the year 1611), of Mr. J. Atkins on "Elizabethan Prose Fiction" (though he seems, perhaps, to ignore too much the influence of direct translations such as the version of Montemajor's *Diana*), and that of Mr. Harold Child on "the New English Poetry," *i.e.*, the verses of Wyatt, Surrey, Barnabe Googe, Churchyard, &c. Father R. H. Benson contributes also a short section on "the Dissolution of the Religious Houses," which to some extent covers the same ground as that treated in Chapter ix., on the English Universities. Father Benson's text, though slight, is pleasantly and effectively written. On the other hand his bibliography might have been enlarged with advantage; such works as those of J. W. Clark on *The Care of Books*, or Poole and Bateson's edition of Bale's *Catalogus* have a reasonable claim to be noticed in connection with the literary activity of the monasteries. In conclusion we can only say that despite occasional minor shortcomings this third volume of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* in every way justifies the high anticipations we formed of the work in reviewing its predecessor.

2.—CHRISTIANITY IN JAPAN DURING THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.¹

This is an extremely valuable study of the early history of the preaching of the Gospel in Japan. The modest appearance of the volume, and the comparatively moderate bulk give little idea of the immense amount of labour which its compilation must have entailed. We have no hesitation in saying that despite its compression, it is by far the most scholarly and illuminative work on Christian Japan which has so far appeared,

¹ *Le Catholicisme au Japon, 1540—1593.* By L. Delplace, S. J. Malines: H. Dierickx-Beke. Pp. 280. Price, 3.50 francs. 1909.

though we do not at all undervalue Father Steichen's useful work on the *Christian Daimios* which has of course the advantage of being written by one well acquainted with the country, and thoroughly conversant with the language of the people. But Father Delplace brings to his task a matured experience and a sobriety of judgment that are priceless in all matters of historical presentment. The volume before us is divided into four books. Book I. deals with St. Francis Xavier, Apostle of Japan, and supplies a very useful corrective both to certain Catholic Lives of the Saint, written over-enthusiastically and without sufficient understanding of the local conditions, as also and still more pronouncedly, to certain modern historians of Japan, who have utterly misrepresented the Saint's mission and his work. In Book II., Father Delplace deals with St. Francis Xavier's first successors, notably Brother Louis Almeida and Fathers Louis Froës and Organtino. This section brings us down to the year 1572, and is supplemented by an extraordinarily valuable collection of letters, which from their rarity and from the difficulty offered to many readers by the Portuguese tongue in which the originals are written have been practically inaccessible to all but a very few. In Book III. the great advance of the Christian Faith is dealt with which followed upon the period of first struggles. Fathers Coelho, Cabral, and Valignani are the principal actors, and we learn from a letter of Father Coelho that in 1582 there were about 200,000 Christians in Japan served by twenty-two priests and forty-six scholastics. In the fourth and last book we have an account of the first trials to which the Christians were exposed when the edict of expulsion was published for the first time in 1587. The book ends with an excellent account of the practical effects of the edict in question as far as the year 1593. There is also an admirably executed folding map and sundry illustrations. In congratulating Father Delplace upon the result of his labours we can only express an earnest wish that he may be able to continue the work down to the time of the final banishment of the missionaries in the middle of the seventeenth century. It were also much to be desired that the book at an early date should find a competent English translator, or, what is perhaps even more necessary, a reading public whose support would justify the printing of an English version.

3.—POPE PIUS IX.¹

Father Raffaele Ballerini, while on the staff of the *Civiltà Cattolica* from 1865 to 1867, undertook to write a history of Pope Pius IX., and in fact completed the first volume. But, owing to the multitude of then living persons mentioned by name, it was thought wiser to keep back the publication for a while, and this decision was soon followed by the invasion of Rome, the iniquitous dispersal of the Fathers of the *Civiltà*, and the interruption of the history. Now that all the actors on the scene have passed away, and the interest in Pope Pius IX. has rather grown than diminished, the book appears, and will be welcomed, not for itself only, but also for the interesting fact that Pio Nono himself read the sheets, made a few marks and comments on the proofs (here reproduced in *fac-simile*), nay more, explained *viva voce* to the writer his opinions on many matters. Although, therefore, this history ends with the year 1846, it is of very unusual interest and value, and gives us authentic statements of the Pope's principles, which can hardly be found elsewhere.

4.—THE RELIGION OF THE PRIMITIVES.²

The new study of religions is one which the Catholic Church is thought to view with disapproval, but this is an unfounded notion. It is, on the contrary, a study which she has every reason to bless, whether in its earlier stage in which it collects and catalogues the positive facts of religious belief, and in its later stage in which it institutes a comparison between the various forms of belief, with the object of discovering the laws of their origin and development. Truth already possessed never need fear the search for more truth, for ultimately, that is, when the later truth has been satisfactorily established, it can only afford a further illustration of the harmony of truth with truth. Still it is most necessary that the facts of this new science should be correctly obtained and estimated, and that the comparisons should be instituted on sound principles. Is

¹ Le prime pagine del Pontificato di Papa Pio IX. By P. Raffaele Ballerini, S.J. Roma: Civiltà Cattolica. Pp. vii, 252. Price, lire 2.50. 1909.

² La Religion des Primitifs. Par Mgr. Le Roy, Evêque d'Alinda, Supérieur-Général des Pères du Saint-Esprit. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. ix, 518. Price, 4.00 fr. 1909.

this the case with the anthropologists who have written classical works on the new science? That is the question which Mgr. le Roy examines in the book before us, which is the first volume of a projected series of *Etudes sur l'histoire des religions*.

He cordially acknowledges that the writers referred to in Europe and America have by their diligent investigations brought together a vast collection of really valuable facts, and have illumined them with most valuable speculations and suggestions. But matters of religion such as these, though they are wont to be regarded as matters concerning which everybody can form a competent opinion, without even requiring to qualify himself by previous preparation, are in fact matters of extreme delicacy, in estimating which it is easy to go astray, and it is to be feared that our classical anthropologists often do go astray. Nor is it wonderful seeing what their methods are. Take, for instance, M. Salomon Reinach, the author of many highly-esteemed books on the Science of Religions. In the course of his arguments he makes frequent reference to modern Catholicism, and finds points of contact between its usages and those of barbarous tribes. But invariably he misrepresents or misconceives modern Catholicism, on which it would have been comparatively easy for him to inform himself. Can we then trust him in his estimates of the beliefs of barbarous tribes? And can we trust him, or others who resemble him in this respect, when they express opinions on the much more abstruse subject of the religion of the Primitives? Indeed, can we trust any on this abstruse subject who have no personal experience of what religious belief is or feels like, and with a conspicuous tendency to misdescribe the mentality of those who have it? At least it would seem to follow that, whilst availing ourselves to the full of the investigations and speculations of these learned men, we need to control their conclusions by those of men who have had as good or better opportunities of studying the so-called Primitives, and have in their own hearts some experience of the psychical phenomena whose evolution is in question.

Thus regarded, Mgr. Le Roy is an excellent witness. After having spent a short time in India, he was sent in 1877, by the Congregation to which he belongs, as a missionary to Africa, and was placed at Bagamoyo, then the port by which were coming and going at that time the great explorers of the mysterious continent, the pioneers of both Catholic and Pro-

testant missions, together with the caravans of slaves belonging to the Bantu tribes from the Victoria Nyanza to Nyassa, from the Upper Congo to Katanga, from Somali Land to Mozambique. Later he made journeys and long stays in many districts of East and Central Africa, until 1893, when he was transferred to the Forests of Gaboon, on the opposite side of the continent. Thus he spent altogether about twenty years in close contact with the natives, with the advantage of a missionary who has won their confidence, and, taking an interest in anthropological studies, he did not neglect his splendid opportunity, as the present and his former works show. In particular he tells us of the many visits he has paid to the encampments of the Pigmies or Negrillos. "I have been their guest," he says, "I have talked with them, I have treasured up all I could get out of them, and I have since supplemented it with the considerable information I have been able to derive from other sources." As the anthropologists start from the assumption that the lowest races are those which most approximate to the Primitives, and as the Negrillos belong to this category, it is particularly important to know correctly what are their beliefs. Mgr. Le Roy reports that their ideas of a Supreme God are purer than those of the more advanced tribes in the midst of whom they live. It is what others have observed too, and what, difficult as it is to harmonize with the evolutionary assumption, it has not been found possible to deny. But whence did these Negrillos derive their comparatively pure idea of God. Here Mgr. Le Roy, drawing on the fruits of his intercourse with them, testifies that they sharply distinguish Mulungo from the heaven or earth or some or other natural objects which he is thought to inhabit; that they do not identify him with "force," totemic or other, a conception quite foreign to them; nor with the "principle of good," which, again, is a conception beyond their grasp; nor with some divinized chief, for they have no chiefs and recognize no special ancestors; nor with ghosts or genii, for they believe God to be anterior to death and to command life, and do not believe the genii to be intermediaries between God and man. Nor do they believe their Mulungo to be the president of an assemblage of inferior divinities, for they are not polytheists. If we further ask how they do reason they cannot answer, but the names they give him, with which their modes of referring to him agree, are most instructive. He is *Katonda* (the Creator), *Mnumbi* (the Fashioner),

Murindzi (the Preserver), *Ahendaye* (the Well-Doer). Is it not clear, then, that the principle of causality is what has guided their spontaneous and unconscious inferences?

This is but one point, though an important one, on which Mgr. Le Roy speaks with authority. For his little volume, though so small, is a complete and well-documented treatise on the science of religion, which should be possessed by those who desire to know what is the present state of a controversy in the issue of which Catholicism is necessarily much interested.

5.—THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS.¹

Dr. Cronin's *Science of Ethics* is the first of two volumes, the second of which is yet to appear. The present volume has for its subject-matter the general principles of Ethics—namely, the character of Human Acts; the Ends of Human Action; the nature and criteria of Good and Evil; the relation of Freedom to Moral Action; the nature of Duty; Hedonism, Utilitarianism, and Evolutionist Ethics; the Faculty by which we know the Good; Imputability; Habits and Virtues; Law and Rights. On all these questions the author expounds the system of Aristotle and St. Thomas, not, he tells us, in any "mere blind acceptance of a tradition," but in a "conviction" that this is the true Ethical system "which has grown stronger and clearer with time and study." We are quite of Dr. Cronin's mind here. It is always refreshing to return to St. Thomas after a season spent in puzzling through the obscurities and dissensions of contemporary theorists. The latter, though they often raise acute difficulties against St. Thomas's positions, are always unsatisfying when they attempt to become constructive: whilst St. Thomas, in his positive teaching, always does satisfy, though one may remain puzzled by some of those acute modern difficulties. But Dr. Cronin has not confined himself to an exposition of St. Thomas's system; nor has he gathered his "objections" from philosophers that have been long since forgotten. That was the unfortunate custom of our Catholic theologians till not so long ago, but we are happily getting out of the rut now, and the present volume is a good example of criticism

¹ By the Rev. Michael Cronin, M.A., D.D., Ex-Fellow of the Royal University of Dublin. Vol. I.: General Ethics. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son. Pp. xx, 660. Price, 12s. 6d. net. 1909.

thoroughly up to date, by the aid of which our students can fit themselves to take part in current intellectual discussions.

We can specially commend the author's convincing discussion of the question of Moral Obligation. Why ought I to do what is right and avoid what is wrong? If we follow St. Thomas the answer is not difficult, but this involves belief in a Personal God. If that is denied or disregarded it is impossible to find a satisfying answer to the question, as is shown by the divergencies of opinion among those who have made the attempt. Indeed the Associationist and Evolutionist schools have by ascribing the feeling of duty to an inherited illusion practically concluded that there is no such thing as Moral Obligation, and M. Guyau does not hesitate to say so expressly. The Kantians, though they insist so strongly on the reality of duty, and conceive themselves to take a more exalted idea of its stringency than do orthodox Christians, in fact undermine its validity as effectually as the Evolutionists. Their contention is that, by common consent of mankind, there is in us all an interior voice which we call Conscience, and which claims authority and commands obedience, but refuses to show any credentials.

Dr. Cronin's criticism on this fascinating but delusive theory is worth transcribing.

(1) Are there such moral impulses or such voices in man as those referred to by the Psychological Intuitionists?

(2) Even if there are, what is their binding force?

(1) I cannot find in my own mind any trace of these impulses, or of a voice commanding me to do certain actions, such as that of which those Intuitionists speak. I find within myself a reasoned judgment that I ought to do certain acts, and that reasoned judgment naturally impels me to those actions. . . . But this is very far indeed from the impulses and the voice spoken of by the Psychological Intuitionists. For (a) the voice of Conscience is described by many of these Philosophers as a voice naturally *superior* to me and *commanding* me through a part of me and within me. But the reasoned judgment I find within my own mind, and which is the only trace I can find of a voice of duty is *my own* judgment, elicited by myself, and, therefore, not superior to me. (b) Also the impulse of duty spoken of by the Psychological Intuitionists, is an impulse which is born with us and arises out of the very nature of man, whereas the impulse of duty of which I am conscious is nothing more than an acquired rational conviction, not innate, but the product, partly of instruction, partly of our own personal reasoning. . . . (d) Again, according to the Psychological Intuitionists, to violate duty is to offend against an *inner*

tribunal to which I am responsible, and of which I am afraid. But my consciousness reveals to me no such *inner* tribunal, and no sense of responsibility or fear of its judgments. When I violate duty I know that I have violated the law of a legislator who is *outside* me, and to whom I shall have to render an account of my action. . . .

(2) Even if there were in man a voice, a feeling, an impulsion such as the Intuitionists describe, urging him to shrink, to bend before an inner tribunal, would man be bound to shrink before such a voice or feeling? Is he bound to acknowledge in any way the binding force of those inner feelings? . . . Feelings, inner voices and such things can rarely if ever be accepted as guides to truth, and the voice that announces itself as the voice of God within us is not likely to be better than any other inner voice or feeling. We have . . . a right to ask—Whence is this voice? . . . How does it justify its claims?

It would be difficult to deal more convincingly with this root error of Kantian ethics, but the reader must take the passage merely as a specimen. There are many equally good, as, to take an instance or two at random—the criticisms on Spencer's principle that "the end of man is the attainment of the maximum of life," or Hegel's and Green's theories of Transcendental Evolution; or of Newman's proof of God's existence from Conscience, which he examines, and, with all respect for the great writer, rejects, as it seems to us rightly.

6.—ASPECTS OF ANGLICANISM.¹

The phenomena of Anglicanism, as we see it around us, must always be of deep and sympathetic interest to us Catholics. It is impossible to view the spectacle of a vast number of pious and intelligent persons struggling in the meshes of a net of contradictions, doubting where they should be certain, positive where they ought to doubt, and wasting great stores of spiritual energy which rightly employed would bring about an immense extension of Christ's Kingdom, without feeling the tremendous pity of it. And nowhere can the Catholic find a more instructive commentary on the Idea of the Church as he has

¹ *Aspects of Anglicanism, or Some Comments on Certain Events in the 'Nineties.* By Mgr. Canon Moyes, D.D. London: Longmans and Co. Reissue. Pp. 499. Price, cloth, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

learnt it than in the travesty of it which is presented by Anglicanism. If the "scanning of error," as Milton assures us, helps towards the "confirmation of truth," it is in the Establishment that we best realize, by the contemplation of their opposites, the true meaning of Unity, Universality, Apostolicity, and the rest as characteristics of the Church. Accordingly we welcome very cordially the cheap reissue of Mgr. Moyes' *Aspects of Anglicanism*, which we reviewed in these pages on its first appearance just three years ago. Father Joseph Rickaby has said somewhere that the best natural preparation for the return of this country to the Faith would be to drill every Englishman thoroughly in logic and history, for that "bad reasoning and perversion of history are two most doughty champions of all that is anti-Catholic." Well, Mgr. Moyes in these lucid and entertaining chapters has made short work of the aforesaid champions. His knowledge of the ecclesiastical history of England is profound and exhaustive, and, not being the victim of an inveterate prepossession, he sets forth in their true light the logical inferences from the facts recorded. His method is a most telling one. Some "modern instance"—an Episcopal pronouncement, an ecclesiastical law-suit, a Congress—gives the occasion of contrasting the old with the new and showing their radical difference. Theory and fact, past and present, are constantly brought into contact with the most illuminating results and the veil of pretence with which, from a growing sense of her deformity, the Establishment has clothed her real features is gradually and gently but most thoroughly removed. The necessity of reconciling contradictions and of explaining away awkward facts has made Anglican spokesmen and writers past-masters in the use of ambiguous language. Mgr. Moyes on his side is a past-master in the art of analyzing such expressions, and those who have to answer Anglican objections cannot do better than take him as their model. To all such and to the whole Catholic body we recommend his book, but convinced Anglicans had better keep away from it: they have no right to read a work which might relax their grasp upon what they sincerely believe to be the true faith.

7.—THE INQUISITION.¹

There is so much need of an English book upon the Inquisition, which while recognizing all the difficulties of the subject and giving proof of a reasonable acquaintance with the results of recent research should state the problems involved from a Catholic point of view, that we are loth to look a gift horse in the mouth and to scrutinize the present volume in any way narrowly. It is not the ideal work for our purposes. We fear that any really effective treatise on this subject would have to be much more bulky, while the proceedings of the Spanish rather than the French inquisitors would have to form the staple of its contents, especially now that Dr. Lea's four volumes on the Spanish Tribunal have all seen the light. None the less the Abbé Vacandard, as might be expected from his high reputation and many valuable contributions to Catholic literature, has given us in less than 300 pages, a book which is certainly serviceable as an aid to Catholic apologetic and which, in the absence of anything more directly to our purpose, may be strongly recommended for the guidance of English readers. The tone of this collection of essays may in the first place be commended for its moderation. The Abbé Vacandard does not attempt to defend impossible positions. He fully admits that the Inquisition is not an institution that Catholics have any occasion to look back upon with pride. He is also far from attempting to throw the whole responsibility for the severity often shown to heretics upon the secular arm, or from pretending that as a whole the tribunal was controlled and carried on purely in the interests of the State. We are even inclined to think that the author goes needlessly far in accepting Dr. Lea's statements and deductions, and that he is not sufficiently alive to the very serious inaccuracies and misapprehensions in which all that writer's works abound. Still, in his concluding chapter the author takes the firm ground that we must judge of the Inquisition and other such institutions according to the ideas of the times and according to the laws of man's moral development, not expecting too much of any human organization which honestly believed itself to be justified in

¹ *The Inquisition, a critical and historical Study of the Coercive Power of the Church.* By E. Vacandard. Translated by B. L. Conway, C.S.P. London: Longmans. Pp. xiv, 284. Price, 6s. net. 1908.

principle. As an illustration alike of the author's position and of the translator's not always irreproachable English, we may quote the following passage :

The Inquisition, established to judge heretics, is, therefore, an institution whose severity and cruelty are explained by the ideas and manners of the age. We will (*sic*) never understand it, unless we consider it in its environment, and from the view-point of men like St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Louis, who dominated their age by their genius. Critics to whom the Middle Ages is (*sic*) an unknown book may feel at liberty to shower insult and contempt upon a judicial system whose severity is naturally repugnant to them. But contempt does not always imply a reasonable judgment, and to abuse an institution is not necessarily a proof of intelligence. If we would judge an epoch intelligently we must be able to grasp the view-point of other men, even if they lived in an age long past.

As any one will find who chooses to consult the original French, this version is extremely free and not always entirely accurate, but, barring occasional faults of grammar, it is quite readable. What we most regret in the Abbé Vacandard's volume is its limited scope—the Spanish Inquisition, for example, hardly coming within its purview, and secondly, its too ready acceptance of Dr. Lea as an authority upon his own valuation, a valuation which assuredly never errs on the side of modesty. If any second edition of the English rendering should be called for (the original has, we fancy, reached a fourth impression), another chapter devoted to chronicling some of Dr. Lea's more glaring errors of fact would form a useful appendix. We may also suggest that the bibliography might profitably be enlarged, for example, by a reference to M. de Cauzon's *Histoire de l'Inquisition en France* and to M. Guiraud's *Chartulaire de la Prouille*, though it is not perhaps quite fair to mention works which have appeared too recently to have been accessible to the original author. But, at any rate, Dr. Ernst Schäfer's *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Spanischen Protestantismus und der Inquisition im 16 Jahrhundert* were published in 1902, and they would serve in many points to correct the very one-sided presentment of the subject which the reader might heedlessly derive from the pages of Dr. Lea.

8.—THE CENTENARY OF ST. CHRYSOSTOME.¹

Centenaries are the order of the day and it is not surprising that the memory of the great Christian orator who in the Greek Church truly ranks as the "equal-of-the-Apostles" should have been suitably commemorated at a time when so many efforts are being made to draw East and West into more sympathetic relations. The handsome volume of studies published in three parts by Messrs. Pustet of Rome and Regensburg, forms a worthy tribute to such an occasion and so far as nationality is concerned it is fully representative in character. England is worthily championed by Abbot Cuthbert Butler and H. W. Codrington, Germany by Dr. Baumstark, Dr. A. Nägele, Professor Sebastian Haidacher and others, the American Mechitarists by Father G. Aucher, Belgium by Dom Placid de Meester, the Greek Uniates by Father Cyril Charon, &c.

It is curious, however, that among a considerable list of contributors, almost the majority of whom belong to the Religious Orders, there should not be included the name of a single Jesuit. Considering the admirable work which is being done in the East at such a centre as the University of Beyrout, or in the West by the Bollandists at Brussels, it can hardly be supposed that no Jesuit Father was qualified by his literary standing to take part in such an undertaking. However, the absence of any particular collaborators in no way impairs the excellence of what we find here before us. It is not a little instructive to note that the liturgical element is now so greatly in the ascendant. No less than 720 pages out of 1,100 are consecrated to this topic, and though we may make a possible exception for the valuable contribution of Abbot Butler, it must be said we think that the honours of the occasion rest with the liturgists. The papers of Dr. Baumstark and Dom P. de Meester are of the highest possible interest, even though they may not always carry conviction, and the other liturgical essays look equally promising, though we have not had time to study them with the attention that they deserve. The volume is admirably printed, and does credit both to editors and publishers.

¹ *Chrysostomika, Studi e Ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo a cura del Comitato per il XV^o. Centenario della sua Morte. 3 Fasc. Roma: Pustet. Pp. 1100. 1909.*

9.—THE SAYINGS OF BUDDHA.¹

English people have ceased to take the interest in Buddhism which was so pronounced a decade or so ago. Apart from the select few, they were never interested in it for its own sake, but only because it was given out that it possessed a species of moral teaching not less lofty than that of Christianity, which therefore could no longer be regarded as unique. Now the inferiority of the former is better understood and the general interest has accordingly dropped. Still, Mr. Hartley Moore has done a useful work in preparing this translation of the *Iti-vuttaka*, for it is an authentic document from which we can now ascertain clearly and without much trouble what is the true character of Buddhist ethics.

"Sayings of Buddha" is the author's free translation of *Iti-vuttaka*, which means literally "thus it hath been said," this formula continually recurring in the text, as may be seen in the specimen we are about to give. The tradition is that the sayings are the very words of Buddha, and this is assumed in the text itself. But the refrain "so I have heard," points to reliance on some oral tradition, whilst the uncertainty both of the age of Buddha, and the age of the writer who reports his sayings, is so uncertain that it is impossible to be certain if the sayings were really his. Still, that does not so much matter, as the sayings must stand on their own merits, Buddha having no independent authority by which to sanction them.

The following is a specimen section of the sayings :

This verily was said by the Blessed One, said by the Sanctified One, so I have heard.

"One of the Laws, O monks, ye do forsake. I am your surety, in that I have entered the path from which there is no return." "Which one of the Laws?" "Ye forsake, O monks, the law against Desire. I am your surety in that I have entered the path from which there is no return."

To this effect spake the Blessed One, and thereupon said the following :

"Through their proper knowledge
Creatures of Discernment forsake the Desire

¹ *Iti-vuttaka* ; or, the Sayings of Buddha. Translated by Justin Hartley Moore, Ph.D. New York : Columba University Press. Pp. xii, 142. Price, \$1.50. 1909.

Through which lustful creatures
Go to misfortune.
When they have forsaken it
They never return to this world."

This is not very invigorating instruction, yet it is fairly typical of the whole. How any one could compare it, save to contrast it, with what is to be found in all parts of our own canonical books is a thing hard to understand. Assuming that to "forsake Desire" is to cultivate contentment, compare this section with Proverbs xxx. 8.

Two things have I desired. These deny me not before I die. Vanity and lying words put far from me. Give me neither poverty nor riches: give me only what is needful for my good. Lest if I be satiated I be induced to deny Thee and say Who is the Lord, or, if compelled by destitution I steal and perjure the name of my God.

Or the more lofty Christian sentiment of Hebrews xiii. 5. "Let your ways be without covetousness, be content with what you have, for He Himself hath said, I will not desert you or leave you."

Even when the precept of the Buddhist saying is sound, which often it is not, indeed, it is hardly so in the quotation given, there is an absolute difference of tone between the two. The one is cold and hard, and unlikely to influence any one, especially if under temptation. The other touches the heart at once with the sweet persuasiveness of its personal note.

Short Notices.

IT is fitting that books on our Lady should claim our regard first in this her month, and it is no mere insular prejudice that moves us to mention at the head of those Father M. Russell's beautiful volume of devout meditations about the Mother of God, which he has called **Behold your Mother!** (Gill and Sons, 2s. 6d. net). He himself describes it in the Preface as a sort of prose sequel to his book of verses, published over twenty years ago, on the same glorious theme; but the feeling and imagination of the poet are equally in evidence in this alien medium, and every page embodies some tender thought, some illuminating phrase, some striking illustration, some jewel from the treasury of a richly-stocked mind. Father Russell's piety is practical as well, and we can imagine few more profitable books to ponder over during the month of May, or indeed during any other month of the twelve.

By a strange coincidence, which after all is not so strange to a Catholic heart, the next May book on our list has the same title as Fr. Russell's—**Voici Votre Mère** (Lethielleux, 1.50 fr.). It forms the crown of a series of preparation-books for Holy Communion by M. l'Abbé J. Millot, the previous volumes dealing with the nature of the mystery, and with the dispositions necessary for worthy reception. In this, the child is conducted through the life of the Blessed Virgin, and shown how those dispositions were present in her in the most perfect form, and that, therefore, she is the best fitted to make her Divine Son known to the young heart. The discourses are simple and short, and each is embellished by an interesting *histoire*, embodying a suitable moral.

Our Lady's life also forms the subject of **La Vierge Marie dans l'Evangile** (Lethielleux, 0.50 fr.), by Y. d'Isné. The different events are arranged in the form of short readings or meditations for each day of the month—that is, made the theme of salutary reflections on the various virtues illustrated in them.

M. Adolphe Retté, who has written **Un Séjour à Lourdes** (Paris: Messein, 3.50 fr.), is one of those French literary men who, after a period spent in aggressive infidelity, have become converted and have devoted their lives to good works. Our readers may remember an account of the singular grace given to him, which appeared in our pages in August, 1907, and was based on his outspoken book, *Du Diable à Dieu*. The present book shows that his turning to God has been sincere and permanent. It recounts how shortly after his conversion he made a pilgrimage on foot to Lourdes to thank our Lady for the favour received, and how there he served for a long time as a *brancardier*, or voluntary assistant of the sick, a function in which the noblest persons in France are proud to employ themselves, and which naturally brings one into close contact with the marvels of that wonderful spot. It is no discredit to the pilgrim's literary style or powers

of observation, that this second part of his book is far more interesting than the first. Nowhere, except perhaps at the shrine of the Apostles, is the power of religion so sensibly felt as at Lourdes, and first-hand impressions of daily events there always make fascinating reading. Besides describing the ordinary sights of the place, which are all extraordinary, M. Retté relates in his vivid fashion the details of many wonders that he saw, and draws out with great skill the consequences involved.

A handbook for those who wish to cultivate an artistic taste, while maintaining the principles of Christianity, has been compiled by M. A. Loisel with the title: *L'Expérience esthétique et l'Idéal chrétien* (Paris: Bloud, 5 fr.). There are too many self-appointed teachers of æsthetics, who endeavour to make art usurp the place of religion in the hearts of men of taste. The book before us, while avoiding all controversy, explains to the *virtuoso* the identity of principles between faith, dogma, and morality on the one side, and all the various arts on the other. The object is ambitious, and the arguments are sometimes almost too severely logical to be convincing. But these are faults on the right side, and the book should prove helpful.

In arranging certain selections from the Old Testament for devotional reading, which he aptly styles *Choice Morsels from the Bread of Life* (Kegan Paul: 2s. 6d. net), Father Charles Coppens, S.J., has, we consider, missed an excellent opportunity of making Bible-reading more popular amongst us. We are not complaining of his using the Douay version—he could not under the circumstances do otherwise—nor of his confining himself to the often inadequate and sometimes superfluous Douay notes, but why, being under no compulsion, did he retain in an edition intended for pious perusal the aggravating narrow columnar arrangement, the senseless arrangement of poetry as prose, and the still more irritating and irrational chapter and verse divisions? Surely it is time that we broke away from this hide-bound tradition of Bible-printing, the original reasons for which have long since disappeared, and served the scriptural Bread of Life for the consumption of the faithful in a manner worthy of its intrinsic excellence.

It gives us a certain insight into the present state of France to find that the recent free-thinking attack on the sanctity of the national heroine, Blessed Joan, has reached its twenty-eighth edition. In his Preface to that issue, M. France has the effrontery to declare that his only declared adversaries have been *les hagiographes*. Yet he must have known how completely Mr. Andrew Lang, surely no “legend-monger,” had refuted his errors and exposed his methods. And no one who reads M. l'Abbé J. Bricout's *Jeanne d'Arc d'après M. Anatole France* (Lethielleux: 0.70 fr.) will be inclined to class the learned editor of the *Revue du Clergé Français* amongst the hagiographers, in any invidious sense of the word. The book is a small one, but every word tells, and if a reputation which rests on skill in pandering to the depraved tastes of a godless public could be overthrown by proofs of critical and historical incompetence and malicious *parti-pris*, it would put an end to the fame of M. Anatole France.

A book full of cheery Christian optimism is *Mehr Freude*, by Bishop von Keppeler of Rottenburgh (Herder: m. 1.80). In a series of bright little essays the Bishop shows the true nature of joy and how it ought to be the habitual disposition of the Christian at all periods of his life. Incidentally, of course, he shows what counterfeit joy is and what courses of thought

and action are destructive of the genuine. A book to be read by the pessimist, who yet has had the courage to learn the German language.

The second volume of the *Manuale Juris Ecclesiastici* (Herder : 13.50 fr. the two) of Father M. Prümmer, O.P., was issued nearly two years before the first, which has lately appeared, and this may account for, though it does not wholly excuse, the fact that we have not noticed the work before this. Yet it is well worthy of notice, being a singularly complete and well-arranged treatise on Canon Law for the use of clerical students, especially of Religious, to whose case the second volume—*Jus Regularium speciale*—is entirely devoted. The first, *De Personis et Rebus Ecclesiasticis in genere*, is of more general interest in itself, and should be of much use here since England has been restored to ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Of course, under a reforming Pope like our present Holy Father, certain departments of Canon Law are apt to become obsolete : but that is a risk which all who treat of a living organism like the Catholic Church must necessarily run.

The same remark applies, though in a less degree, to a volume of the same general character which reaches us from America. It bears the singular title, *The Law of Church and Grave* (Benziger, \$1.35 net.), and is the work of C. M. Scanlan, LL.B., an eminent legal authority in the States. We cannot help thinking that the last word of the title, although it appears both on the cover and the title-page, is a misprint for *State*, otherwise we can give it no intelligible meaning, for the work, although it treats incidentally of cemeteries, is quite universal in its scope. We can well believe that it will fulfil its sub-title and become *The Clergyman's Handbook of Law*, in America at least, for it is very thorough, and although necessarily brief in its treatment of various questions, it is well provided with references to fuller works. The main object of the writer is to treat of law as it affects the clergyman, and to show where the common Law of the Church, and the common Law of the United States agree and where they differ.

Law mainly of another sort—the Law of Conscience—is the theme of a little Latin book which is very familiar to all students of Moral Theology, and has now reached its eleventh "corrected and enlarged" edition, *Asserta Moralia*, by Father Matharan, S.J. (Beauchesne, 1.50 fr.). It supplies a much-felt want by bringing before the mind in a clear and concise form, the great general principles which are necessary for the solution of moral difficulties, definitions of terms which make them more intelligible, and positive enactments which are not easily retained in memory. The busy priest cannot find a more efficacious means of renewing his acquaintance with the various departments of this immense field of study.

M. le Chanoine Barbier in *La Guerre Continue* (Lethielleux, 0.60 fr.) pursues the theme which occupied his previous volumes, viz., *La Crise de l'Eglise de France*. His little studies will be very useful to the future historian of this troubled epoch, for they are always *bien documentés*, and preserve the record day by day of acts and utterances of great significance which might otherwise be forgotten. We hope that the time is at hand when the Canon's pen will be engaged on events of more hopeful augury, indicating the long-deferred and practical protest of a nation which is being robbed of its faith.

The *Essay on Shelley* by Francis Thompson—an Essay which was once refused by the *Dublin*, and which when accepted took a noble revenge by sending that excellent quarterly into a second edition—has been reprinted

by Messrs. Burns and Oates, and issued in a dainty volume with a Preface by Mr. George Wyndham. One cannot help contrasting this poet's prose with the prose of another great poet lately removed by death. Just as Thompson surpassed Swinburne in spiritual insight, so did he surpass him in greatness of style. As English and as criticism, this one Essay is worth a great deal of the elder poet's alliterative polysyllables and riot of epithet. Swinburne had little discrimination; in praise or in denunciation he was always extreme. But here we have a fervent Catholic criticizing a militant atheist, and yet managing to separate the poet from the man, and the man from his errors, and assigning its just meed to every phase of the complex personality he was analyzing. As for the Preface, many who know Mr. Wyndham only as a politician will here learn with surprise that he is a literary man first. His estimate of Thompson, thrown off in a private letter to a friend, is worthy of its place next Thompson's estimate of Shelley, and we can give it no higher praise.

In *Les Croyances Religieuses et les Sciences de la Nature*, M. l'Abbé Guibert essays the old theme of the conflict between Religion and Science. He is well aware that there is no such conflict in reality, that all truth is from God and therefore self-consistent, and that any apparent divergence arises from one or other of these departments of knowledge unwarrantably invading its neighbour's territory. But the man in the street is struck by the divergences, and does not know how they are to be explained. This knowledge M. Guibert supplies, in a series of very readable lectures on the various points of supposed disagreement. If he seems severe on Science it is because Science, latterly at any rate, has most often been found trespassing outside its province. But he shows a competent knowledge of both subjects, and is therefore well equipped to show that they do not really contradict each other at their various points of contact.

The purpose Father Matharan's book, noticed above, fulfils for Moral Theology is fulfilled for Dogmatic and Moral combined by **Facts of Faith**, compiled by the Rev. A. B. Crane (Art and Book Co., 1s. 6d. post free.) That is, it sets out in the order of the Catechism the dogmas of the Catholic faith and their main implications. We fancy this booklet, which is in its second edition, will be found very useful by catechists, and indeed, by all who wish, as all should wish, to know their faith to the limits of their intellectual capacity. For the faith in question is a practical faith, and includes not only knowledge of what they should believe, but also of what they should do. The language is not theologically technical, but simple and clear, and the little book is much to be commended.

That beautiful lyrical drama or song-cycle which finds a place in the Word of God, and which we know as the *Canticle of Canticles* has been the subject of innumerable commentaries of every degree of divergence and of merit. In one of the latest, *Le Cantique des Cantiques*, by Père Joüon, of the University of Beyrouth (Beauchesne, 5 fr.), the author declares his belief that the only safe way to interpret the obscure problem of the origin and literal meaning of this poem is to rely upon the most ancient traditions, critically sifted to their original elements. This criterion has led him to decide that the Canticle is an allegory first and foremost, expressing the mutual love of Jehovah and Israel. He contends that the naturalist interpretation which would make the poem a collection of genuine love-songs, attributes to the Jews of that age ways of thought and feeling historically inaccurate. We cannot in our space discuss his proofs, but they are elaborated at great length with much philological and historical learning.

The latest of Father Bearne's stories, but not, let us hope, the last by a very long way, is called **Jack South** (Messenger Office, 3s. 6d.), and the character who plays the title-rôle bids fair to rival in attractiveness the famous Lance Ridgingdale himself. Unlike the average "boys' book," *Jack South* is not a string of adventures told in slipshod slang, although there is incident in plenty, and the dialogue is quite natural. The charm of it lies in the high ideals of boyhood depicted or suggested, both positively and negatively, in a style which is always a worthy vehicle for its lofty moral.

There are many pages of **Between Friends**, by Richard Aumerle (Benziger, 3s.), which we have read with only the haziest idea of what they meant, for the book is a school-story from across the Atlantic, and is written in American. However, it goes with a decided rush, and has plenty of humour and an excellent moral. And the strange new world it reveals is calculated to knock the conceit out of any British boy who thinks that what he doesn't know of life isn't knowledge.

Cupa Revisited, by Mary Mannix (Benziger, 1s. 6d.), also hails from the States, but it is a girls' story, and naturally much more sedate and refined and less exciting than the above.

MM. Bloud and Cie., the enterprising Paris publishers, have brought to our notice yet another of their very useful series, the *Bibliothèque de Psychologie Expérimentale et de Métapsychie*. The ninth volume treats of **L'Évolution Psychique de l'Enfant**, and is the work of a specialist in the health of the very young, Dr. H. Bouquet, whose wide personal experience has enabled him to trace with some appearance of system the growth of the infantile senses and intellect. The seventh and eighth are devoted to studying the effects of **Le Hachich**, that subtle drug which allows its victims brief glimpses of a sensual paradise at the cost of long intervals of terrible depression. It is a very elaborate and detailed exposure of the nemesis which invariably attends all abuse of natural pleasures.

Certain selections from the Hebrew Bible—**Capita selecta sine punctis impressa** (Longmans, 1s. net.)—have been edited by Professor G. Wilkins, T.C.D., for the use of students of that ancient tongue. The Professor, in an elegant Latin Preface, indicates how the book can be used with advantage, *sc.*, by the student putting in the vowel-points in pencil and then, after recalling his grammar and glancing at the Masoretic text, by correcting all the *errata et erubescenda*. Next day you can rub them out and try again, and a short but pertinacious application to this exercise will make you an expert.

It is claimed for **La Route Choisie**, by Marc Debrol (Lethielleux, 2.50 fr.), that it unites all the fascination of the realistic novel with the moral rectitude of the *conte bleu*—a sufficiently rare combination. The story is concerned with an old theme—the inadequacy of worldly pleasure to satisfy the cravings of the soul. The soul in question here, however, does not seek the usual refuge provided by novelists, who think that the cloister is mainly peopled by those who have loved and lost, but finally finds contentment in a world better understood and used as it should be.

In appearance, **A Garland of Pansies**, by G. M. Jameson (Washbourne, 1s.), resembles one of those early Victorian *bijou* books which we thought altogether extinct. It contains a little collection of verses in English and Latin, some trivial enough, some refined and scholarly. The *Imprimatur* and *Nihil Obstat* at the beginning seem out of place in a volume which does not treat professedly of matters of faith or morals.

The opening sentences of *The Romance of a Nun*, by Alix King (Rebman, 6s.), "I am a nun. Yesterday I was . . . the most troublesome pupil in the Convent of the Nativity," give the measure of the author's knowledge of the religious life. The Rev. Mother, forsooth, out of inordinate affection for the school-girl, had dispensed her from the noviceship! The rest of the story is in the same key, and the whole is founded on an utter misconception of the spirit of Catholic training and of the motives for Christian asceticism. It is full of gross lapses of taste in its handling of sacred things, and in spite of some pretensions to style it belongs to the same literary and ethical genre as *Maria Monk* or the novels of Mr. Hocking.

We notice in the sixth volume of *Round the World*—an illustrated reading-book issued by Messrs. Benziger at the odd price of 3s. 3d.—an entertaining article on *Squirrels as Pets* which alone should make the volume acceptable to youth. But all the essays, on such diverse subjects as *Rubies*, *Ocean Liners*, *The Post Office*, *Cliff-Dwellers*, &c., are full of useful information, graphically set forth.

Le Vicomte de Chalvet-Nastrac has filled a gap in recent French history by publishing *Les Projets de Restauration Monarchique et le Général Ducrot* (Picard : 7.50 fr.) wherein are detailed at great length, from the recollections and correspondence of one of the principal actors in them, the events, which after the overthrow of Napoleon III. led to the establishment of the Third Republic. We see once more, but from a new point of view, how the cause of monarchy suffered from intestine divisions in face of weaker but more united opponents. The General's intimate relations with the Comte de Chambord make his evidence particularly valuable.

We must for want of space dismiss summarily a number of pamphlets sent to us. Mgr. Moyes' learned and eloquent sermon, on the occasion of the celebration at Westminster Cathedral of the eighth Centenary of St. Anselm has been published by Messrs. Burns and Oates for sixpence. Professor Georgio del Vecchio sends us several reprints of articles from an Italian Sociological journal. Of these the most considerable is entitled *Diritto e personalità umana nella storia del pensiero*. A recent pastoral of the Bishop of Christchurch, New Zealand, contains an impassioned denunciation of the dangers of indiscriminate reading which is well worth the attention of parents and guardians. *A Plea for Real Representation* gives an effective exposure of the disadvantages and injustice of the present electoral system. M. l'Abbe Charles Sentroul in *Qu'est-ce que la Philosophie?* gives an able vindication of Philosophy against the false notions that prevail concerning its nature and scope. *Mélanges Japonais* is a quarterly review published in Tokyo by French missionaries and now in its sixth year. It is devoted naturally to matters of interest concerning the language, customs, and history of Japan, which, now that the Faith is being revived so energetically in that wonderful country, should be matters of interest to all Catholics. We trust, that in time, some similar periodical will be published in English and thus reach a wider public. We may note, meanwhile, that the subscription for the *Mélanges* is 7.50 fr. yearly and it can be ordered from M. Ernest Leroux, 28, Rue Bonaparte, Paris.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

*(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)**Art and Book Co., London:*

FACTS OF FAITH: By A. Bromley Crane. Second Edition. Pp. 187
Price, 1s. 6d., post free. 1909.

From the Authors:

VARIOUS PAMPHLETS on Philosophical and Social Subjects: By Professor Giorgio del Vecchio. QU'EST-CE QUE LA PHILOSOPHIE? Par l'Abbé Charles Sentroul. Pp. 40. 1904. UN SEJOUR A LOURDES: By Adolphe Retté. 4me édit. Pp. 316. Price, 3.50 fr. 1909.

Beauchesne, Paris:

ASSERTA MORALIA: By M. Matharan, S.J. 11a edit. Pp. 276. 1909. LE CANTIQUE DES CANTIQUES: By P. Joüon. Pp. viii, 334. Price, 5.00 fr. 1909.

Benziger Brothers, New York:

CUPA REVISITED: By M. E. Mannix. Pp. 136. Price, 1s. 6d. 1909. ROUND THE WORLD. Vol. VI.: Pp. 212. Price, 3s. 3d. 1909. THE LAW OF CHURCH AND GRAVE: By C. M. Scanlan. Pp. vii, 265. Price, \$1.35 net. 1909. BETWEEN FRIENDS: By Richard Aumerle. Pp. 194. Price, 3s. 1909.

Bloud, Paris:

L'EVOLUTION PSYCHIQUE DE L'ENFANT: By Dr. H. Bouquet. Pp. 100. Price 1.50 fr. 1909. LE HACHICH: By Raymond Meunier. 3me édition. Pp. 219. Price 3.00 fr. 1909.

Burns and Oates, Ltd., London:

SHELLEY: By Francis Thompson. Pp. 91. Price 2s. 6d. net. 1909. ST. ANSELM OF CANTERBURY: By Mgr. Canon Moyes. Pp. 43. Price 6d. net. 1909.

Cambridge University Press:

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY: By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., and M. R. James, Litt. D. Pp. 108. Price 5s. net. 1909. FLETE'S HISTORY OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY: Edited by J. A. Robinson. Pp. viii, 151. Price 5s. net. 1909. MENDEL'S PRINCIPLES OF HEREDITY: By W. Bateson. Pp. 396. Price 12s. net. 1909.

Cary and Co., London:

MASS IN HONOUR OF ST. CATHERINE DE RICCI: Composed by William Sewell. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Civiltà Cattolica Press, Rome:

LE PRIME PAGINE DEL PONTIFICATO DI PAPA PIO IX.: By P. R. Ballerini, S.J. Pp. vii, 232. Price, 2.50 lire. 1909.

Columba University Press, New York:

ITI—VUTTAKA; OR, THE SAYINGS OF BUDDHA. Translated by J. H. Moore. Pp. xii, 142. Price, \$1.50. 1908.

Gill and Son, Dublin :

THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS : Vol. I., GENERAL ETHICS : By Rev. M. Cronin, D.D. Pp. xx, 660. Price, 12s. 6d. net. 1909. BEHOLD YOUR MOTHER ! : By Father M. Russell, S.J. Pp. xii, 176. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

Herder, Fribourg :

MEHR FREUDE : Von Bischof von Keppler. Pp. 200. Price, m. 1.80. 1909. MANUALE JURIS ECCLESIASTICI : Tom. I., By Dom. M. Brümmer, O.P. Pp. xxii, 505. Price, 8.00 fr. 1909.

Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., London :

CHOICE MORSELS FROM THE BREAD OF LIFE : Selected by Charles Coppens, S.J. Pp. 672. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909.

Lethielleux, Paris :

LA GUERRE CONTINUE : Par Paul Barbier. Pp. 128. Price, 0.60 fr. 1909. JEANNE D'ARC D'APRES M. ANATOLE FRANCE : By Abbé J. Bricout. Pp. 128. Price, 0.60 fr. 1909. LA ROUTE CHOISIE : Par Marc Debrol. Pp. 251. Price, 2.50 fr. 1909. VOICI VOTRE MERE : By Abbé J. Millot. Pp. 323. Price, 1.50 fr. 1909. LA VIERGE MARIE DANS L'EVANGILE : By Y. D'Isné. Pp. 131. Price, 0.50 fr. 1909.

Longmans, Green, and Co., London :

ASPECTS OF ANGLICANISM : By Mgr. Moyes. Re-issue. Pp. 550. Price (paper), 2s. net. 1909. LIBER GENESIS : CAPITA SELECTA SINE PUNCTIS EXPRESSA : By George Wilkins, T.C.D. Pp. 22. Price 1s. net. 1909. A PLURALISTIC UNIVERSE : By William James. Pp. vi, 404. Price 5s. 6d. net. 1909.

Maclehose and Sons, Glasgow :

REGINALD PECOCK'S BOOK OF FAITH : Edited by J. L. Morison, M.A. Pp. 315. Price, 5s. net. 1909.

Messenger Office, Wimbledon :

JACK SOUTH : By D. Bearne, S.J. Pp. 266. Price, 3s. 6d. 1909.

Picard et Fils, Paris :

LES PROJETS DE RESTAURATION MONARCHIQUE ET LE GENERAL DUCROT : By Vicomte de Chalvet-Nastrac. Pp. viii, 381. Price, 7.50 fr. 1909.

Pustet, Rome :

STUDI E RICERCA INTORNO A. S. GIOVANNI CRISOSTOMO. Fasc. II. III. Pp. 722, 180.

Rebman, London :

THE ROMANCE OF A NUN : By Alix King. Pp. 330. Price, 6s. 1909.

R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd., London :

A GARLAND OF PANSIES : By G. M. Jameson. Pp. 86. Price, 1s. 1909.

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Summary of Contents.

I.

Revue des Questions Historiques. (1909). II.

- P. Guiraud.*—Private Property in Rome.
J. Vidal.—The last Ministers of the Albigenses.
E. Rodocanachi.—The Castle of S. Angelo under Alexander VI.
G. Tholin.—The Armagnacs and the Feudalism of the South of France.

II.

Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie. (1909). II.

- M. Hofmann.*—The Reorganization of the Roman Curia.
J. Stuffer.—St. Cyprian and the Doctrine of Penance.
B. Jansen.—The Divinity of Christ in the Synoptics.
E. Michael.—German History and the History of Art.
N. Paulus.—The Origin of our Indulgence System.

III.

Études. April 20.

- Mgr. de Cabrières.*—The Beatification of Jeanne d'Arc.
H. Joly.—The Psychology of Jeanne d'Arc.
H. Thurston.—Jeanne d'Arc in English opinion.
E. de Forceville.—Jeanne d'Arc in nineteenth century French Art.
J. B. Ayroles.—The Jeanne d'Arc of M. Anatole France.
J. Boubée.—Jeanne d'Arc at Poitiers.

IV.

Revue Bénédictine. (1909). II.

- A. Wilmart.*—Three new fragments of the oldest translation of the Prophets.
G. Morin.—An unprinted Pelagian tractate of the early fourth century.

- R. Ancel.*—The Trial and Overthrow of the Carafas.
G. Morin.—Pseudo-Fulgentius.

V.

Revue Pratique d'Apologetique. April 1 and 15.

- J. Guibert.*—The Apostolate of Mercy.
P. Dunand.—The Jeanne d'Arc of MM. Thalamas and A. France.
A. de Poulpique.—The Argument from Martyrdom.
E. Sortais.—Catholicism and Democracy.
P. Ponsard.—A good Heart.
H. Lesêtre.—The Paschal Season.
A. Farges.—M. Bergson and the problem of Contingence.

VI.

Der Katholik. (1909). IV.

- F. Sawicki.*—The religious Sense according to modern ideas.
J. B. Metzler.—The Beginnings of the consecration of May to our Lady.
P. Schips.—The theory of a Sub-consciousness.
A. Zimmermann.—The growing dearth of Vocations to the Anglican Priesthood.

VII.

La Civiltà Cattolica. April 3 and 17.

- Precocious Depravity.
 The Jubilee of Darwinism.
 The New Vatican Gallery.
 Moral Education in Japan.
 A general History of Christian Apologetic.
 Joan of Arc.
 The Resurrection of Christ in the Poets.
 The Question of Reordination and the Bishop of Salisbury.
 An Introduction to the New Testament.

